3.50

Carry on!

Lewis Allen

THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO · DALLAS
ATLANTA · SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
OF CANADA, LIMITED
TORONTO

THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

By

DEVERE ALLEN

EDITOR, THE WORLD TOMORROW

NEW YORK

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1930

COPYRIGHT, 1930,
BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

All rights reserved—no part of this book may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher.

Set up and printed. Published November, 1930.

SET UP BY BROWN BROTHERS LINOTYPERS
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE FERRIS PRINTING COMPANY

To Marie

WHO GAVE THE SPARK
AND FOSTERED THE FLAME

FOREWORD

THE American movement for world peace has behind it a century of pioneering. Neglected until recently by historians, ignored by the savants who compile encyclopedias, there has been no public comprehension of the force this developing enterprise has exerted on our national life and character.

Nowhere yet is there an adequate record of the organized war against war which first took form in the United States and to which the early American peace societies so gallantly contributed throughout the world.

The rôle of the movement, it is true, has largely been defensive. The story is chiefly one of hard defeats and illusory successes. There have been victories, none the less, and noble, agonizing struggles, quickened into colorful drama by some of the world's most gifted personalities.

These men and women, their aims and deeds, their splendid loyalties and their betrayals, their cautious compromises and their daring ventures, should be indelible. Yet they have perished from all common knowledge. More vital and more vivid than many who are better known, under the corrosion of incredible disregard they have disappeared from the living pages of the past.

Small wonder that our discussions of war and peace teem with untrue generalities; that so much peace planning is unpoised by real perspective; that so many literary and oratorical flights above the battle reveal the absence of an earth-inductor compass.

The farmer, the chemist, the teacher, for example—and by now increasingly the social scientist—have access to a body of experience. Not so the engineer of peace. Every new effort he makes is still a pioneering venture. His process is almost

entirely trial and error. Availing himself of no lessons from the past, he labors under the impulsion of ideas which are oftentimes remote from present-day reality.

This book is not, however, a history of the peace movement. In favor of a more popular treatment, and through a desire to apply the obvious lessons of experience to a time which needs them sorely, I have departed from the method of the chronicler—though not, I trust, from sound historic fact.

For definite reasons I have liberally resorted to direct citation. First, to remove any doubt regarding the authenticity of the material. Further, to eliminate the boredom of abundant footnotes—which, for the reader who wishes to investigate for himself, are grouped at the end of the book. And further still, to convey not only the meaning of ideas and persons, but more interestingly the emotional and intellectual flavor of which they were compounded.

Unorthodox views must invariably run a severe critical gauntlet. It ought to be so. One test in particular should be ruthlessly applied to such a work as this. Has the writer, in order to establish a preconceived thesis, either deliberately or unwittingly selected untypical facts and quotations in order, willy-nilly, to prove a case? Few of those who have inquired even superficially into the literature of the peace movement of previous days will be free from this suspicion; and it cannot be denied that each organization has emphasized its own historic mission and has presented its own efforts and leaders without any attempt at a critical evaluation. Important facts, when unfavorable, have often been entombed in diplomatic silence. The answer in the present instance lies entirely in the sources, to which I will assist all skeptics.

Again, thoughtful readers will regard one hundred and fifteen years—the life span of the organized peace movement—as a brief time in the life of nations. They may feel moved to defend the peace groups from certain of the book's critical observations on the ground that in so short a period no

substantial success in the abolition of war could reasonably be expected. They may charge the writer with unwise impatience. To this argument I reply that to-day, at least, the nature of modern warfare is such that the times cry out for more, not less, impatience. Humanity is not faced with a problem in abstract mathematics but with a knife-blade at its jugular vein.

With reiteration, I have borne down on the need of a more drastic opposition to war, the war system, and its perpetuators. For this I offer no apology. The supporters of war are the ones who must be ever on the moral defensive—they and the advocates of conventional work for peace: the former because of their destructive record in the past, the latter because of their too general ineffectiveness and their almost perpetual confusion.

The evidence of experience, to be sure, is only a partially useful guide for present and future policy. No one appreciates more than I what Randolph Bourne once called the wisdom of inexperience. There is stirring among the younger spirits of the world a new determination, a new realism, a new and striking grimness which bodes no good to Martian idols. The relatively rapid growth of this new attitude dates almost entirely from the World War and its aftermath, and is mainly independent of the earlier work for peace.

There is, though, ample reason why the past should be brought nearer. For the story of the peace movement reënforces, often by sheer contrast, the vigor and validity of more thoroughgoing methods. The social value of these methods is implied throughout the book and they are set forth explicitly in the final chapters.

DEVERE ALLEN.

CONTENTS

		PAGE
	FOREWORD	vii
CHAPTER		
I.	THE PIONEERS	3
II.	THE RELIGIOUS URGE TO PEACE	15
III.	A GREATER "GREAT ILLUSION"?	27
IV.	REPENTANCE, LTD.	47
V.	TWIN WARS: "AGGRESSIVE" AND "DEFENSIVE"	61
VI.	TOWARD UNION OF THE WORLD	89
VII.	ARBITRATION'S LONG CAREER	119
VIII.	HUMAN NATURE VS. HUMAN NATURE	137
IX.	THE BATTLEGROUND OF ECONOMICS	153
X.	WAR AS AN OUTLAW	175
XI.	ARGUMENTS OF THE FIGHT FOR PEACE	195
XII.	MORE ARGUMENTS OF THE FIGHT FOR PEACE	221
XIII.	WOMEN IN THE FIGHT FOR PEACE	263
XIV.	THE MILITARY JUGGERNAUT	293
XV.	THE FIGHT FOR WAR	323
XVI.	RIVAL TACTICS OF THE EARLY YEARS	361
XVII.	CRISES	389
XVIII.	TRIAL—AND ERROR	423
XIX.	UPHILL—AND DOWN	465
XX.	THE PERENNIAL QUEST FOR UNITY	515
XXI.	THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE RADICALS	525
XXII.	PEACE TACTICS FOR THE PRESENT DAY	543
XXIII.	THE PACIFIST INHERITANCE	567
XXIV.	THE NEWER PEACE DYNAMICS	603
XXV.	ALMOST THOU PERSUADEST ME	647
XXVI.	CREATIVE PEACE	673
	APPENDICES	679
	REFERENCES	701

CHAPTER I

THE PIONEERS

Some mysterious unconscious impulse appears to be a concomitant of natural order. This impulse has always been unsettling the existing conditions and pushing forward, groping after something more elaborate and intricate than what already existed. This vital impulse, élan vital *as Bergson calls it, represents the inherent radicalism of nature herself. This power that makes for salutary readjustment, or righteousness in the broadest sense of the term, is no longer a conception confined to poets and dreamers, but must be reckoned with by the most exacting historian and the hardest-headed man of science.*—JAMES HARVEY ROBINSON, in *The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology, and Scientific Methods.*

CHAPTER I

THE PIONEERS

BETWEEN the events of the early nineteenth century and those of the corresponding period in the twentieth, there is a striking parallel. In each instance a series of economic factors, coupled with nationalistic rivalries, irresponsible statesmanship, and dependence on balances of power for security, had culminated in colossal warfare. Each time the settlement which followed was arranged by the great powers with scant concession to the sensibilities of smaller countries seeking to influence the decisions of the peace conference. Each settlement contained the germs of future wars, and the various war zealots came from each conflict little chastened.

In the last century, as in this, there ensued a revulsion of sentiment against such wholesale slaughter. Renewed interest in world peace was evoked in many conscience-stricken people, and occasioned a great increase in anti-war activity.

Of one hundred and twenty-seven years terminating in 1815, England had spent sixty-five in war and sixty-two in "peace." The young United States on its own part had gone through the senseless War of 1812, which never had whole-hearted popular support and which gained not a single thing originally stated as our war aims. This experience, plus the affront to decency in the shambles of Europe, was responsible, if not for the first clear outcry against the curse of war, for the rapid emergence, here and there, of more and more peace partisans.

Gathering strength from feeble beginnings, this new passion for the abolition of war was speedily crystallized into the world's first peace societies. In 1813, at the crest of Napoleon's prestige, Dr. David Bogue, a London preacher of considerable

fame, delivered a sermon on "Universal Peace," in the course of which he made the following significant suggestion: "As we live in an age of societies to combine individual efforts for public benefit, why should not one be formed for promoting peace among the nations of the earth?"

Years afterwards, in describing these early days and their eventuation in organized peace efforts, one of our American peace journals piously but shrewdly observed: "No individual deserves the sole honor of originating this movement; it was the result of providential causes operating powerfully on the mass of minds throughout Christendom." [1]

On the night of June 7, 1814, William Allen, an English Quaker—linguist, educator, preacher, man of science, and publisher of *The Philanthropist*—thumbed the pages of his diary and made the following laconic entry: "A meeting to consider of a new Society to spread tracts, etc., against war." [2] But the meeting in William Allen's house did not result, until June 14, 1816, in the actual establishment of the Society for Permanent and Universal Peace, with its declaration that "War is inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity and the true interest of mankind," and with ten original members, comprising Churchmen, Non-conformists, and Friends. This occurrence, and Allen's interest in peace societies, is not even mentioned in the forty-six-page sketch of his life in the five-volume set of *Quaker Biographies* published during 1916 by Friends in the United States! Not the least of the world's injustices is the regrettable inability of long-dead men to write their own life stories in perspective.

By virtue of the delay in England the honors, arguing by the calendar, came to this country. For, entirely unknown to each other at the time, three peace societies were formed here during 1815. One, under the presidency of David Low Dodge, a devout Presbyterian, in New York City on the sixteenth of August; another on the second of December, at Vienna, Ohio, chiefly composed of Friends; while the evening of December twenty-eighth witnessed a gathering in the home of the Reverend William Ellery Channing, composed mainly of Christian ministers of liberal denominations under the

leadership of the Reverend Noah Worcester, who there organized our most vigorous early anti-war group, the Massachusetts Peace Society.

Behind this culmination were years of idealism manifested in the teachings and the lives of Quakers, Shakers, and other religious bodies whose principles embraced pacifistic tenets, Find work for international peace at any stage of the movement's development, and you will not seek far before discovering the quiet, persevering handiwork of Friends. Long had they labored to spread their principles of peace.

One of their farthest-flung voices, using the language of the printed page, was that of Anthony Benezet, early foe of slavery, apostle of practical good will in everyday living, and pamphleteer of pacifism. Of meager stature and stalwart modesty, he refused to have his portrait done, exclaiming, "Oh, no, no! My ugly face shall not go down to posterity!"

Posterity can spare his face, for it has some knowledge of his force of character. It was he who, upon the outbreak of the Revolution, possessed the temerity to scatter where he could, to many in high places in this country and abroad, a pamphlet expressing his *Thoughts on the Nature of War.* In 1780 came another from his pen, *The Spirit of Prayer, with Some Thoughts on War.* The kind of thoughts he broadcast rang with passionate outspokenness:

> What thievery bears any proportion to that which, with the boldness of drum and trumpet, plunders the innocent of all they have? . . . What honor has war gotten, from its thousands and tens of thousands of men slaughtered on heaps, with as little regret or concern as at loads of rubbish thrown into a pit? Who but the fiery dragon, would put a wreath of laurel on such heroes' heads? Who but he, could say unto them, Well done, good and faithful servants? Youths in "nameless numbers" have been either violently forced or tempted in the fire of youth and full strength of sinful lusts, to forget God, eternity, and their own souls, and rush in to kill or be killed, with as much furious haste and goodness of spirit as a tyger kills tyger for the sake of his prey.

Twenty-one years later, in 1801, appeared a pamphlet by the Reverend Job Scott—New Englander, Quaker by choice,

globe-trotter of good will, prolific author, a man so conscientious that he suffered privation during the Revolution rather than accept paper currency issued to finance the war—entitled *War Inconsistent with the Doctrine and Example of Jesus Christ, in a Letter to a Friend.* Over the next third of a century at least five editions in this country and England were put out, and circulated widely. Forthright in speech, this Scott:

> I have not merely to oppose men who oppose all the order of society, by committing depredation and offence universally; but those who interlard the system of blood-shed with the profession of christianity. . . . I therefore avow the following proposition as a sentiment closely connected, and one with the nature of true christianity, and as a sentiment which will finally prevail:
> *That war, in every shape, is incompatible with the nature of christianity; and that no persons professing that religion and under the full and proper influence of the temper and mind of Christ, can adopt, pursue, or plead for it.*

First of all publications directed against war, exclusive of those by Friends, was in all probability *The Battle Axe,* by Timothy Watrous. Watrous was an outstanding member of the Rogerenes, a rebellious sect of eastern Connecticut. While the Rogerenes because of their disavowal of warfare were locally referred to as "Quakers" on some occasions, they were distinct in origin and different in doctrine. Watrous could not get his pamphlet printed, so fiery was it, and so jubilant over the success of the Revolution which had just ended were the people. His son, also named Timothy, revised the manuscript, while another son, Zachariah, inventor of the coffee mill, devised a printing press for the sole purpose of putting out this scathing attack on war.

Even had there been no others prior to 1809—and the chances are there were—several students who deserve our eternal thanks for making a record of the pioneers [8] are thus technically in error when they follow without qualification the lead of the early American Peace Society, which said in 1828, in its first general circular letter, that "the first tract, composed professedly and exclusively for the cause of peace, which—

so far as is known to this board—ever appeared in this country, was written by a merchant of the city of New York in the year 1809, and was entitled, *The Mediator's Kingdom Not of This World.*" One author, forgetting the teachings of Lao-tse, Confucius, Buddha, and Jesus; overlooking the writings of Sully and the Abbé St. Pierre, William Penn, and many others, goes so far as to call this publication "the earliest peace literature in the world!" [4] This merchant-author was David Low Dodge.

The error regarding the American pamphleteers indeed is merely technical, and noted here simply for the sake of the record; not only because David Low Dodge accompanied his pamphleteering with organization, but because, riding in on the wave of nausea over the horrors of the Napoleonic insanity in Europe, his influence was the greatest thus far of the early peace crusaders. Dodge really "started something." "If war," he declared, "is an inhuman and cruel employment, it must be wrong for Christians to engage in it."

Such an insinuation was too much for the good Christian soldiers in the congregations of Manhattan. They sprang to arms, and in the name of the Nazarene poured execrations on the aristocratically poised and dark-haired head of the thirty-five-year-old dry goods merchant. And when, five years later, Dodge came out with a still more pointed onslaught against war, *War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ,* the clamor was louder than before. What? Take war away from Jesus? Where then would be his ministers, zealously assuring their flocks that the cross and the cutlass were Holy Twins when used against Great Britain—in that instance—for the defense of Right? A committee of three literary men, one a clergyman, had issued an attack on Dodge's earlier pamphlet, calling their defense of war, *The Duty of a Christian in a Trying Situation.* Dodge followed with a rebuttal which won him some adherents. But the second pamphlet of that first war year as it slowly spread about, uncorked so many vials of wrath that one can understand why the organ of the Massachusetts Peace Society should have said of Dodge's organization:

In August, 1815, a small number of worthy characters formed a Peace Society in the City of New York; but for some prudential reasons, they deferred for several months a public avowal of the existence of such a Society.[5]

Measured in relative terms, the influence of Dodge's writings was tremendous; they were republished in other cities, and their author's influence on the peace movement, though his radicalism alarmed a great many, remained considerable for years. "Some," he once confessed, "who were favorable to the doctrines of peace judged that, with a bold hand, I had carried the subject too far; and doubtless, as it was new and had not been much discussed, I wrote too unguardedly, not sufficiently defining my terms."[6] That, of course, is a matter of judgment on which there may be difference of opinion even now. In any case, he spoke with truth when in later years he modestly asserted on behalf of his pamphlets, "These publications gave the first impulse in America, if we except the uniform influence of the Friends, to inquiry into the lawfulness of war by Christians."

After Dodge, the deluge! Came a pamphlet—author unknown—called *Thoughts on the Practical Advantage of Those Who Hold the Doctrines of Peace Over Those Who Vindicate War, Addressed to Those Who Follow Peace with All Men.* In Norwich, Connecticut, David Low Dodge's father-in-law, the Reverend Aaron Cleveland, a renowned anti-slavery preacher who had been converted by his son-in-law—to whose opinions he had been at first inhospitable—preached a pair of sermons on "The Life of Man Inviolable by the Laws of Christ"; and stable citizens of ye olde Connecticut gossiped wonderingly about these radical ideas.

In Boston the Reverend Daniel Chessman, a young Baptist only a year out of Brown University, poured his burning peace views into a fifty-two-page manuscript which he called *An Essay on Self-Defence, Designed to Show that War is Inconsistent with Scripture and Reason.* It rivals in force and cogency the modern arguments on the authority of the Gospels, with a deal of secular polemic power added.

New York peace campaigners seized upon the works of Erasmus and in 1813 brought out a booklet of selections from his *Antipolemus, or the Plea of Reason, Religion and Humanity Against War,* beginning:

> If there is in the affairs of mortal man any one thing which it is proper uniformly to explode; which it is incumbent on every man, by every lawful means, to avoid, to deprecate, to oppose, that one thing is doubtless war.

while Adna Heaton, in his twenty-thousand-word pamphlet published in New York, on *War and Christianity Contrasted,* was discomfitingly inquiring of professing followers of Jesus:

> Can the christian appeal to his conscience, that he has in him the same mind that was in Jesus his Lord, when he prays for vengeance on his enemies, or indulges emotions of hatred or revenge toward them? Can he say, that he walks as his Master walked, when under the direction of his lust, his feet run swiftly to shed blood?

And the Reverend Samuel Whelpley, under the pen-name of "Philadelphus," was publishing broadcast a series of *Letters Addressed to Caleb Strong, Esq., Late Governor of Massachusetts, Showing* (provided anyone ever got beyond the title) *That Retaliation, Capital Punishments, and War, are Prohibited by the Gospel; Justified by no Good Principle; Not Necessary to the Safety of Individuals or Nations; But Incompatible with Their Welfare; and Contrary to the Laws of Christ.*

But there are pamphleteers and pamphleteers. King of them all so far as brilliant style and argument are counted, was Noah Worcester, prime mover and corresponding secretary of the Massachusetts Peace Society. He is second in the chronological order of great leaders in the movement. Worcester had served in the Revolution. He was already fifty-six years old when, on Christmas Day of 1814, he let loose upon the world the most effective pamphlet on the question ever written: *A Solemn Review of the Custom of War; Showing that War Is the Effect of Popular Delusion and Proposing a Remedy.* Worcester was never a radical, like Dodge, who, he

thought, had gone too far. But just as his mild pseudonym of "Philo Pacificus" concealed a pen of mighty power, so his rotund, benevolent countenance, fringed with whitening hair, hardly revealed the keen, clear mind that worked so trenchantly behind it.

So strong was even Worcester's pamphlet, that one shudders to think what a dressing-down this Revolutionary War veteran would receive from the super-patriotic spirits of the D. A. R. and other effervescent loyalists in the present time, should they ever fall upon his writings. Happily for the public accord, original copies of his tract are as scarce as saints, and the edition brought out in 1904 by the American Peace Society is minus most of his frank strictures on war-making governments.

One shudders more, however, to realize that this historic tract narrowly escaped the fate of Daniel Chessman's manuscript—to remain unpublished through the lack of funds. Once published, it received an amazing circulation for those days; two members of the Society of Friends made financially possible the free distribution of several thousand copies; it was translated into other languages and was still being read in Europe many years after its issuance. Its immediate acclaim is pleasurably described by Worcester in these words:

> It is now about three years since he [Worcester is writing in the third person] offered that work to publishers. But the subject was so new and the prospect so gloomy, that, while they were friendly to the sentiments, they declined publishing even a small edition at their own risk; and he, having need to be cautious, agreed with his generous printer to share with him in the *profit* or the *loss* which should occur on the sale of the edition. Now, in this country and Great Britain, that tract has passed through as many as *ten* or *twelve* editions—two of which amounted to 22,000 copies.[7]

This from *The Friend of Peace,* edited in Boston by Noah Worcester for nearly fifteen years, and described with charming incorrectness in a peace magazine of October, 1927, as follows:

The first periodical devoted exclusively to the cause of international peace was titled the Friend of Peace. It was the product of Noah Webster, the first number being published in Philadelphia in 1816.*

The 1816, anyway, is right! And with respect to its fertility of ideas, its zest, its readability, and its solid informational content—considered, of course, in relation to its handicaps—the term of "first" has something more than a chronological justification.

In France, the "Society of Christian Morals," having for its object the application of the precepts of Christianity to the social relations of life, but largely interested in work for international peace, was set under way on the fifteenth of August, 1821—chiefly through the influence of an English ironmaster, Joseph Tregelles Price, who gave to William Allen the idea of establishing the first peace society in England.

A peace society was organized at Geneva, Switzerland, in 1830, by the Count de Sellon. By 1825, there were about twenty-five separate peace societies functioning in the British Isles.

In the United States, meantime, they had been steadily on the increase. In Maine, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Vermont, North Carolina, and other states, peace societies of local influence were springing up, one after another, until by 1828 there were about three dozen of them altogether.

On the tenth of February of that year, it was voted by the Peace Society of Maine, "that it is expedient to adopt measures for the formation of a national peace society." Similar votes were taken in most of the other societies; until, on May 8, 1828, an amalgamation of these friendly groups was effected under the federative title of The American Peace Society, and our first national peace organization was an actuality.

Around these dry bones of fact were wrapped the dreams and energetic devotion of the next great leader in the move-

ment's history. William Ladd, never a literary light, but a genius at organization and a persuasive speaker, was a comparative newcomer in the cause; and here as in many another period, a newcomer proved to be its salvation. Ladd owed his abhorrence of war and his zeal for peace partly to the personal inspiration of his friend, the late President Appleton of Bowdoin College, and perhaps more to the famous pamphlet of Noah Worcester. At first a conservative, he became a radical by conviction though never by temper; able to see the sincerity in those of other views despite his stoutly maintained personal convictions, he overleaped with his reconciling spirit the vast distances still unshortened by telegraph, telephone, or railroad, and kept alive an incredible fellowship and unity; a oneness sustained more than eighteen years.

More of this man's work and thought will be brought out in later chapters. It is enough to note here that the labor of Dodge, the great awakener, and that of Worcester, the convincing preacher by the printed word, had now passed to the leadership of Ladd, the gifted organizer. All three were indispensable; and all three belong in the roster of our great immortals.

CHAPTER II

THE RELIGIOUS URGE TO PEACE

He never failed to say and keep up his paternosters every morning, whether he remained in the house, or mounted his horse and went out in the field to join the army. It was a common saying among the soldiers that one must "beware the paternosters of the Constable." For as disorders were frequent, he would say, while muttering and mumbling his paternosters all the time, "Go and fetch that fellow and hang me him up to this tree"; "Out with a file of harquebusiers here before me this instant, for the execution of this man"; "Burn me this village instantly"; "Cut me to pieces at once all these village peasants who have dared to hold this church against the king!" All this without ever ceasing from his paternosters till he finished them—thinking that he would have done very wrong to put them off to another time; so conscientious was he!—"M. le Constable de Montmorency," from *Lives of Distinguished Men and Great Captains,* by the ABBÉ DE BRANTOME, 1527-1614.

CHAPTER II

THE RELIGIOUS URGE TO PEACE

THESE pages are not written just for Christians. But they are written out of facts.

To-day, the organized forces struggling directly for peace embrace all creeds, all faiths, and those with no religious affiliations at all. Not only the churches, but an immense variety of sectarian bodies are lined up against war, and among them are labor groups, some of the radical political parties, and individuals, naturally of the utmost imaginable diversity. Nevertheless it remains true that in organized Christianity the peace movement had its origin; and so for a time, until we reach the developments of later years, we shall confine our attention largely to the relation between peace work and Christianity.

The first peace organizations were directly associated with the Christian religion. Most of their officers were ministers. David Low Dodge was a conservative churchman, though not an ordained preacher. Noah Worcester was a Congregational divine. William Ladd, though a retired sea captain, joined the Second Congregational Church at Minot, Maine, and later took his ordination vows.

At the end of its first year, the Massachusetts Peace Society announced a total of one hundred and seventy-three "respectable members"—without mention of any other category—and its respectability was enhanced, no doubt, by the inclusion of "more than 50 ministers of religion." Though the ratio dropped the next year—eighty clergymen out of three hundred and four members altogether—"the greater part of the new members are persons of respectable standing and influence," which meant, at that time, certainly, that they were in good status

with the churches. Many of the societies held their annual meetings on Christmas night.

Uniformly the anti-war impulses of those early days were rooted in the pious devotion of conscientious Christians. You might paraphrase the famous remark of Horace Greeley that "all Democrats are not horse thieves, but all horse thieves are Democrats," and declare with truth that while all Christians were not peacemakers, all peacemakers were Christians. All, that is, in the peace societies.

No Christian pacifist of to-day need flatter himself that he has contributed any substantial originality to the religious case for peace. The special responsibility of Christians for the abolition of war, because of Jesus' teaching, was recognized by all pioneer spokesmen of the cause. Noah Worcester, in his *Solemn Review,* expressed the typical attitude among the anti-war minority when he declared:

> If the Christian religion is to put an end to war, it must be by the efforts of those who are under its influence. So long, therefore, as Christians acquiesce in the custom, the desirable event will be delayed.

Acquiesced they have, and delayed it is; for from that day to this, the professing Christians of every country have had two different attitudes in time of peace and one less attitude in time of war.

Would it not be possible to match, almost word for word, in our Christian anti-war literature of to-day (except that now it would be put more mildly, possibly) the following passionate protest of Noah Worcester in 1815?

> It may be doubted whether a complete history of all the conduct of infernal spirits, would contain anything more inconsistent, more abominable, or more to be deplored, than has appeared in the history of *warring Christians.* To behold two contending armies, from Christian nations, so deluded as mutually to offer prayers to the same benevolent God, for success in their attempts to butcher each other, is enough to fill the mind of any considerate person with amazement and horror.

The precise meaning of Jesus' teachings in respect to war

was fully as much a matter of concern to these early peace workers as to any modern Christian pacifist. "Is it not a circumstance worthy of some notice," dryly remarked a writer in *The Friend of Peace* in 1816, "that Jesus omitted to say, 'Blessed are the war makers; for they shall be called true patriots'?"

Nor did they fail to challenge the orthodox war exegesis of their clerical opponents. When confronted with Jesus' reference to his coming to bring, not peace, but a sword, or his driving the money changers out of the temple—the stock in trade of every similar anti-pacifist critic of to-day—they retorted usually with almost the same general facts and reasoning as those employed, say, by the distinguished Biblical scholar, C. J. Cadoux, author of *The Early Christian Attitude to War* (1919). Thomas Clarkson in England—whom William Lloyd Garrison called in a sonnet "the good man eloquent"—had published his *Essays on the Doctrines and Practice of the Early Christians, as They Relate to War.* Joseph John Gurney, the English Quaker, wrote on the subject also. And Jonathan Dymond, another English Friend, whose premature death at the age of thirty-two deprived the peace movement of a mind it ill could spare, bequeathed to posterity his keenly analytical *Inquiry into the Accordancy of War with the Principles of Christianity, etc.*

The work of Clarkson, Gurney, and Dymond was speedily available to the peace movement in this country and served as the basis of such widely circulated dissertations as that, for example, issued in 1836 by Professor Thomas C. Upham of Bowdoin.[1]

The scholarship of these pioneer peace writers is most interesting. They quote Tertullian; they use Origen's work against Celsus; they tell the dramatic story of the youthful pacifist martyr Maximilian; they demonstrate so admirably that one rather questions why many later comments should be needed, the reasons why a typical early follower of Jesus drove down a spiritual stake with the firm declaration, "I am a Christian; therefore I cannot fight." The example of the faithful, how-

ever, has had almost as little practical influence on the majority of later Christians as Jesus has himself.

The Battle over Army Chaplains

No less than Christian pacifists since the World War, were the spokesmen of the early peace societies exercised by the rôle of military chaplains. Says one of the early tracts of the American Peace Society:

> Statesmen of our own, though at the hazard of being branded as infidels, have objected to the employment of chaplains among our soldiers, on the ground that the religion they teach is incompatible with the duties of war. . . . If war is wrong, its chaplain, employed for its support, *must* countenance what the gospel condemns; and hence his very office is unchristian. . . . We judge not the *men;* we merely condemn their *business* as unchristian. So the gospel itself does; so common sense is fast coming to do; and posterity will yet look back, and wonder how any ambassador or disciple of the Prince of Peace could ever have lent himself to such a libel of blood on his peaceful religion. Would you have war cease? It never can so long as Christians support it by their prayers.[2]

Especially interesting is this early attitude of the American Peace Society in view of the fact that as recently as December, 1921, the same Society's journal boasted how the organization "has stood by the United States Government in all of its wars of over a century." This apostasy was a trifle exaggerated, happily, for as we shall later see, the record really stands at nearer half and half.

There have always been found some to hold with firmness. George Fox, founder of the Society of Friends, was offered in 1650 a captaincy in the army of the Commonwealth, but promptly declined.

> I told them I knew from whence all wars did rise, even from the lust, according to James' doctrine, and that I lived in the virtue of that life and power, that took away the occasion of all wars.[3]

The March 19, 1835, issue of *The Christian Mirror* contains a striking letter from the Reverend Stephen Thurston, of

Maine, stating why he refused an offer to serve as chaplain in the militia.

If it is right for me to act as chaplain to the militia at home, it would be right for me to join the army in that capacity in time of war. . . . If I were to join the army in this capacity, I should be expected to impart, on all suitable occasions, moral and religious instructions to the soldiers. Suppose that on the eve of some important battle I should preach from the well-known words of our Saviour, "Put up thy sword into its place; for all they that take the sword shall perish by the sword"; or the words, "Love your enemies"; and suppose that I should speak according to the spirit and the meaning of these texts; should I be considered as acting the part of a good chaplain? Would it be a suitable preparation for a work of slaughter upon which they were soon to enter? But would not such preaching be in perfect accordance with my duty as a minister of the gospel of peace? And is it not evident that my duty as chaplain to an army would be quite inconsistent with my duty as a minister of Christ?

And in complete agreement with such a view, Professor Upham declared:

We assert it with entire confidence, that, were it not for the countenance which they receive from professed Christians in the ranks of the army and particularly from the chaplain, the soldiers themselves, hardened as they are by the tendency of their occupation, would experience more misgivings, more doubt, more compunction of heart in their work of destruction and blood, than they are now generally found to do. They conclude, and very naturally too, if a preacher of the Gospel, a commissioned minister of the Most High, with all his capabilities for forming a moral and religious judgment of things, approves their employment and prays for its success, it would be an excess of scrupulosity in them to entertain a doubt.

From then until now, the attack on the idea of military clergy has been constantly recurrent. One of the most recent critics is Bishop Francis J. McConnell, of the Methodist Episcopal Church:

I am sure, however, that the chaplaincy, as at present conceived of in the armies of all nations alike, aims at spiritual ministry only in a secondary fashion. Governments establish chaplaincies for

the increase of the effectiveness of the fighting forces. Let not the Church befool itself on this point. The interest of war parties in religion for their own side is the same sort of interest they have in poison gas for the enemy—just the desire to make their own side win more quickly.[4]

And yet the alliance between the church and the military is just as strong officially as ever; the bond between the two is not relaxed. And should another conflict come, ministers of the religion of Jesus will doubtless be found in abundance to bolster up the fighting men's morale, that they may better wield the bayonets and hand grenades and liquid fire and lethal gases.

Not the whole long century of protest in the name of Jesus; not the many citations from the early Christian martyrs; not the intermittent drumfire on the backs of chaplains, have availed to turn the Christian world as a whole from its first allegiance to the gods of battle.

War and the Missionary Enterprise

While the late great Christian War was on, church leaders confessed lugubriously in private, and occasionally in the open, to a certain worry over its effect on missions. Then and ever since, missionaries have brought back experiences revealing the distrust of Christianity by "the heathen"; though non-Christians, like Gandhi in India, have almost uniformly found no quarrel with Jesus himself. And just as the peace societies have lost few opportunities to publish these outside criticisms of gunboat Christianity, their early prototypes were steadfast in the same unwelcomed service. Said *The Friend of Peace* in 1816:

> The warring character of Christian nations has for ages been one of the greatest obstacles in the way of extending the light of the gospel. Indeed it has occasioned a dreadful eclipse of this light, and hid it under a bushel. The Peace Societies wish to remove the cause of this eclipse, and the great obstacle to the conversion of the pagans.

They were still wishing, when a couple of decades later the Reverend Mr. Simpson, an earnest missionary to one of the

South Sea Islands, wrote back home and complained because the natives were learning that Christian countries, so-called, slaughtered each other's populations in war. The native leaders became eagerly imitative, but suffered defeat in a military expedition against some neighbors. Whereupon, says Mr. Simpson, "a great falling off in our adult and children's school followed, and has continued to a great extent up to the present time." And William Ladd, commenting on this episode, succinctly noted "progress": "The spears have disappeared from Rurutu, and the nations now fight, like Christians, with muskets."

About this time Dr. Joseph Wolff, the missionary and traveler, was telling his audiences of the Jewish listener in London who had startled him one day by saying: "You go to war, and you call the Lord Jesus Christ the Prince of Peace, and you pray to him, as the Prince of Peace, to aid your warriors to vanquish your enemies." [5] Thus Professor Upham was reminding his Christian readers that the emperor of China, in refusing admittance of the Christian religion, gave as his reason that "wherever the Christians go, they whiten the soil with human bones." [6] And a little later, Joshua P. Blanchard, one of the most undiscourageable fighters for peace, was saying in *The Christian Citizen:*

> Missionaries of the Cross do not hesitate to encounter the storms of ocean, the dangers of pestilential climates and untried privations, that they may administer this panacea for universal evil, vainly imagining that the message of divine life they carry will be able to withstand the counteracting martial aggressions which accompany it, or that a truth will have power to produce the peace and joy and righteousness in a foreign land it has hitherto failed to effect in their own.

Said the Reverend Rufus W. Clark of Portsmouth before the American Peace Society in 1851, of the natives who had shown persistent hostility to our missionaries:

> Their hatred arose from the dread of Christian armies, and their horror of the refined cruelties and awful barbarities of Christian battles.

At a huge peace meeting in Mystic, Connecticut, in 1884, the Reverend R. McMurdy, leader in the movement for arbitration, drove home the bitter words of the melancholy King Theodore of Abyssinia:

> First came the missionaries, then the consuls, and after them, the armies.

—thus anticipating the same doubt of the churchly ambassadors' usefulness expressed by a pacifist during the World War in verses drenched with lye:

> If you can flood the world with Holy Bibles
> And follow them abroad with Holy Bombs.[7] . . .

No wonder that a missionary, Dr. James M. Yard, exclaimed in 1927:

> So many missionaries have faced bitter criticism of Chinese and Indians since 1918. The Orientals say, "You preach love, peace, brotherhood—what do you mean? There never was fought such a cruel, fiendish war as you Christians have just engaged in. What good is Christianity anyway?" [8]

Well, what good is it? Good for a great deal and not all failure! But for how many centuries longer the missionary can labor under such a handicap with the non-Christian world; and how long he will continue to tolerate the position of rank hypocrisy in which he is perpetually kept, is not a purely academic query.

Significant was the petition sent to the United States Legation at Peiping (then Pekin) by twenty-five American missionaries in 1924, urging that "no form of military pressure, especially no military force," be used to protect them or their property, and that in the event of their capture or death at the hands of lawless persons no money be paid for release and no indemnity be demanded. "We take this stand," they said, "believing that the way to establish righteousness and peace is through bringing the spirit of personal good will to bear on all persons under all circumstances, even through suffering wrong without retaliation."

Significant also was the declaration of the great international missionary conference at Jerusalem in 1928 that "the protection of missionaries should only be by such methods as will promote good will in personal and official relations," and that mission societies "should make no claim on their governments for the armed defense of their missionaries and their property." Here is a portent of great promise. How thoroughly it may be embodied, how uniformly it may be tried in actual practice under critical tests, only time can reveal.

The ability of the Christian religion to confront the world with the war viper coiled contentedly in its bosom has seemed endless. There have been heartening signs of awakening conscience in the last few years. Yet even now, no adequately deep or pervasive repentance has been manifested. And this despite the outcries over the betrayal of the church's founder, despite the witness of the early Christians, despite the anomaly of fighting parsons, and despite the obvious embarrassment about the ever-contradictory Christian missions.

CHAPTER III

A GREATER "GREAT ILLUSION"?

The loud little handful—as usual—will shout for the war. The pulpit will—warily and cautiously—object—at first; the great, big, dull bulk of the nation will rub its sleepy eyes and try to make out why there should be a war, and will say, earnestly and indignantly, "It's unjust and dishonorable, and there is no necessity for it." Then the handful will shout louder. A few fair men on the other side will argue and reason against the war with speech and pen, and at first will have a hearing and be applauded; but it will not last long; those others will outshout them, and presently the anti-war audiences will thin out and lose popularity. Before long you will see this curious thing; the speakers stoned from the platform, and free speech strangled by hordes of furious men who in their secret hearts are still at one with those stoned speakers—as earlier—but do not dare say so. And now the whole nation—pulpit and all—will take up the war-cry, and shout itself hoarse, and mob any honest man who ventures to open his mouth; and presently such mouths will cease to open. Next, the statesmen will invent cheap lies, putting the blame on the nation that is attacked, and every man will be glad of those conscience-soothing falsities, and will diligently study them, and refuse to examine any refutations of them; and thus he will by and by convince himself that the war is just, and will thank God for the better sleep he enjoys after this process of grotesque self-deception.—MARK TWAIN in *The Mysterious Stranger,* written in 1898, published posthumously in 1916. (Used by permission of Harper and Brothers.)

CHAPTER III

A GREATER "GREAT ILLUSION"?[1]

HOPE springs eternal, and undaunted by recurrent disillusionment, the peace societies never ceased to dream of different days within the institution of the Christian Church. They envisaged always a little church around the corner, wherein might yet occur the marriage of the Church and Jesus, sending forth disciples of international peace until the whole of Christianity should be won to its own professed ideals and program for the human family.

Said William Ladd in 1824:

> Perhaps at no time since the apostolic age has pure and undefiled religion so generally prevailed, as at the present; nor has peace among Christian nations been so general. There is scarce a "speck of war" in the horizon. There has been a very evident change in public opinion respecting war. And we have great reason to hope that the time is not far distant, when men "shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks, and nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."[1]

Noah Worcester, a decade earlier, had begun to glow with hope because of the certainty with which, he felt, the clergy would rally to the cause. In the peace societies, he ventured to believe,

> we may hope to engage every true minister of the Prince of Peace and every Christian who possesses the temper of his Master. . . . The Bible Societies, already formed in various parts of the world, must naturally, and even necessarily, aid the object now proposed. Indeed, the two objects are so congenial, that whatever promotes the one, will aid the other. Nor is it easy to see how any Bible Society could refrain from voluntarily affording all possible encouragement to peace societies. The same may be said of all missionary societies, and societies for propagating the gospel.

Still more imbued with fervor, he exclaimed in another place:

> Where is the godly minister of any sect, or where is the man renowned for talents and virtue, who has attended to the subject, that feels any disposition to oppose the efforts for the abolition of war? Truly we have not heard of so many as *three* respectable opponents, among all who have read what has been written on the subject. Was there ever a subject brought forward in our country, so novel and half so interesting, which met with so little opposition? May we then not humbly hope in God that in less than fifty years from this time, our country will be as free from war advocates, as it is now from advocates for the African commerce in slaves?[2]

This was assuredly a robust expectation; for far in advance of abolitionist sentiment, public opinion was unitedly opposed, throughout the North, at least, to a further continuance of the slave trade.

"Fifty years from this time!" The Northern armies were then being disbanded while the South looked on in sullen helplessness: and the United States lay exhausted from one of the bloodiest conflicts in history, at which other nations where slavery had been abolished without bloodshed and with a modicum of bitterness, could only stare aghast.

And yet, Noah Worcester's prophecy was modest in comparison to another he printed incidentally at about the same time:

> If we may calculate on a progressive increase for years to come, proportionate to that of last year, we may pretty confidently expect, that at the commencement of the year 1820, there will not be found in New England a single advocate for the custom of war, among all the ministers of religion in every denomination.[3]

In one sense, neither the long-term nor the short-term prophecy was wrong. For by 1820, the evidence seems to indicate, there was not left one clergyman in New England—or elsewhere—who believed in war. And at the end of the Mexican and Civil wars, were there any ministers who did not ardently believe war wrong and peace the way of right? You are doubtless asking, What is wrong with this picture?

Since the pioneer peace work began to spread its influence, it has won practically all ministers and most "respectable" laymen to its cause. Peace societies have grown through the passing years, and they have welcomed the interest of the clergy and churchmen who, after every war, have once more devoted themselves to the ideal of brotherhood.

After every war—there is the answer to the paradox. A ministry flocking to the banner of peace in 1820, and calling persistently for peace throughout the hundred years since then; yet during times of testing, when wars came on—once, twice, thrice, four times—blessing all these wars (and the innumerable lesser hostilities in between) when it was popular to do so, giving armed violence its full and free support, and finding each time reasons plausible enough to justify its action. Like the clergy in each instance, on the other side. Like the clergy in all nations, on all sides of every conflict.

Yes, the pulpits and the pews of Christian churches have been for peace, through all the last loud century. Yet wars have come, the altars have been our best recruiting stations, and in this whole long time the church has never so much as attempted an opposition to war that actually amounted to a snowball in the muzzle of a "seventy-five."

But there had been substantial precedent. From the capture of the church by Constantine about 312 A.D.—regarded first as the capture of Constantine—the Christian religion has served as Mars' faithful handmaid.

One of the Crusaders wrote home to his highly pious family that "our men returning in victory, bearing many heads fixed on pikes and spears, presented a glorious spectacle for the people of God."

As kind old Saint Bernard put it, so thought the Church: "The Christian who slays the unbeliever in the Holy War is sure of his reward, the more sure if he himself be slain. The Christian glories in the death of the infidel, because Christ is glorified."

The mediæval Spaniards, seeking to carry their religion into everyday life, as it were, used to call their warships by devout

nomenclature: "The Blessed Virgin," "The Holy Ghost," "The Most Holy Trinity," "The Conception," "St. John the Baptist." Philip II sent out his Great Armada only after many hours on his knees in prayer for victory; and the English after defeating Philip's fleet, struck off a medal bearing the inscription in Latin, "God blew at them and they were dispersed." The old British falcon of the sea, Sir John Hawkins, named his buccaneering slaveship the "Jesus." Our own battleship "Princeton" boasted a mammoth gun called "The Peacemaker" which in 1844 ironically blew up and killed the American Secretary of State and almost did away with President Tyler.

The New England Pilgrims, so central were firearms in their way of life, measured distance by a musket shot; they came to a pond, for example, "about a musket shot broad and twice as long." [5] The Massachusetts colonists put a bounty of a hundred dollars on Indian scalps; and unlike William Penn, relied upon their aim for safety.[6]

The Puritans' old training days on Boston Common were gala celebrations; prayers and psalm-singing were followed by a banquet, and after this came target practice, with guns and cannon, at a stuffed human figure, for prize awards offered to the best marksmen.[7]

The men from the Hartford settlement who participated in the bloodthirsty massacre of the Pequots at Mystic, Connecticut, under Captain Mason, were cheered on their way by a minister:

> Your cause is the cause of heaven, the enemy have blasphemed your God and slain his servants.[8]

As Indian children and defenseless women and youths roasted to death in the flames wantonly spread through the fort by Mason's men, prayers were wafted toward the sky from the lips of a so-called man of God, who, after victory, blessed the bestowal of young, attractive captives into slavery among the settlers' families. Mason's fellow-leader Underhill, in answer to later criticisms of the ferocious butchery (which

sickened even the Englishmen's allies, the Narragansett Indians) explained it in this way:

> It may be demanded, Why should you be so furious? Should not Christians have more mercy and compassion? But I would refer you to David's war. . . . Sometimes the Scripture declareth women and children must perish with their parents. . . . We had sufficient light from the word of God for our proceedings.

So thought Richard, first of the New England Mathers, who from his pulpit publicly raised a pæan of praise because "on this day we have sent six hundred heathen souls to hell."

The same spirit that prompted President Oakes of Harvard University in 1675 to brand liberty of conscience as "the first-born of all abominations" [9] served in matters military to howl down those who would not fight. Long before the Revolution, during the French and Indian Wars, President Samuel Davies of the College of New Jersey (later Princeton University) took keen delight in serving the Lord with pro-war sermons. In one he got out of his system a quotation often employed by others in succeeding years:

> . . . methinks the cowardly soul must tremble lest the imprecation of the prophet fall upon him, *Cursed be the man that keepeth back his sword from blood.*[10]

Spirit of Seventy-six

And then the Revolution. The military services of the preachers are glowingly set forth by J. T. Headley in his *Chaplains and Clergy of the Revolution*—a book brought out in 1861 as a stimulus to the ministry of that tense time. "Oh, how deep down," says Headley, "in the consciences of men had the principles of that struggle sunk, when they made those Puritans forget the solemn duties of the sanctuary for the higher duties of the battlefield."

Now there are principles and principles; and no matter how high the principles adduced at every crisis by the clergy who went berserk, the simple fact is that, collectively, they have backed any and every war that came along, with only a handful

of overridden dissenters. Somehow that bleaches out the sanctity of pro-war principles.

But nothing ever fazed the war-mad pulpiteers. Dr. Robert Davidson of Maryland addressed at different places the troops of the Continental Army, assuring them that the war was of God. Dr. Samuel West of Dartmouth turned his homiletic artillery on the loyalists and non-warring sects alike, and thundered: "God has manifested his anger against those who have refused to assist their country against its cruel oppressors"; and flung upon all and sundry non-military minds the curse of Meroz:

> Curse ye Meroz (said the angel of the Lord), curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof, because they came not up to the help of the Lord against the mighty.

Dr. Langdon of Harvard, three weeks before the Battle of Bunker Hill, declared to the Colonial Congress at Cambridge after recounting the joyous destruction of British lives at Chelsea:

> If God be for us, who can be against us? . . . He can command the stars in their courses to fight his battles, and all the elements to wage war with his enemies. He can destroy them with innumerable plagues, and send faintness into their hearts, so that the men of might shall not find their hands.

Illusion

Hopes; and hopes betrayed. Of such a mixture were the coming years composed.

In Providence, Rhode Island, on the twenty-sixth of February, 1816, the Reverend Thomas Williams counseled, on a literalistic basis, patience and good cheer, for God would end war when he wanted to—and perhaps might want to soon.[11]

In a circular letter of the Massachusetts Peace Society in 1816—its bow to the universe—"the time we hope, is near," so it was stated, "when not only ministers, but all classes of Christians, will be 'of one heart and soul' in ascribing praise to the

'God of Peace' that they lived to see that day in which Peace Societies were formed in our land."

Judge Thomas Dawes, at the second anniversary of the Massachusetts Peace Society, bespoke himself with frankness:

> What a solecism, that two adverse armies of Christians should be drawn out in battle array, each by its chaplains invoking the Lord of Hosts, and calling for the destruction of the other . . . whilst hungry vultures on the neighboring rocks are watching with impatience to enjoy the carnage.[12]

But while the peace societies spread, their influence on the masses and on governments was little more than nil; and how about the Christian community Worcester visualized as flocking to the standard? Said *The Friend of Peace* for January, 1821, in somewhat sobered tone,

> Considerable additions have recently been made to the Massachusetts Peace Society and to the branch societies in Jaffray and Hollis, N. H.; it is however much to be regretted that Christians in general are so little disposed to promote an object of such infinite importance to themselves, to their posterity, and to the world.

Northward in Portland, Maine, on Christmas, 1827, another preacher, the Reverend Charles Jenkins, said a thing or two:

> As yet a large portion of the class of nominal Christians who perceive, that the Bible reveals a system of religion adequate to bring the human family universally to cease from individual and national hostilities, have appeared to wait in indolent expectancy, until the Most High shall be pleased to make the gospel more fully reveal its power, in every where and entirely meeting the moral exigencies of the world.[13]

William Ladd, a little later, gave the picture as he saw it in these words:

> Religion is still made subservient to war in *every* Christian nation. Christian ministers discover no inconsistency with their sacred duties, in praying for the success of the bloody struggle and for the destruction of their enemies.[14]

Leonard Bacon, the well-known New Haven pastor, spoke for the cause with boldness. Said he, at Hartford, 1832:

The impropriety of a Christian minister's bearing arms; the necessary exemption of the professed minister of Christ from all the bloody laws and rituals of military honor, has always been more or less distinctly recognized by the common sentiment of Christendom, from the days of the apostles to this hour. Why? Simply because it was always felt, even in the darkest age of chivalry, that the spirit of the gospel is irreconcilably at variance with the spirit of wartime enterprise.[15]

But the cause of peace, said Thomas S. Grimké, of South Carolina—sturdy anti-war campaigner if there ever was one—before the legislature of Connecticut and the citizens of New Haven, also in 1832,

can never triumph until the Christian clergy, individually and as a body, shall condemn, universally and unconditionally, war and the warrior in every form as they have condemned private violence and the duellist.[16]

Apparently, however, despite some striking gains that will be noted, the churches as a rule weren't doing it. The fourth annual report of the Hartford County Peace Society, dated 1832, declared:

We appeal to the affecting fact of many of the disciples of the Prince of Peace being yet found among the advocates of war, and some even on the battlefield, as proof that the subject demands particular and distinct attention.

Said Ladd, toward the end of 1834, writing as "Pacificator":

The "appeal to heaven" by duel has long since been condemned by all true Christians, but the "appeal to heaven" by war, a much greater barbarism, still remains sanctioned by the church, and is preceded by fasting and prayer. Ah, when will Christians be enlightened on this subject also?[17]

There are many now who would like to know the answer. Some in that time were openly coming out for peace, and others were under too much pressure yet to do so. Through *The Calumet* in 1835—organ of the American Peace Society at that time—it was announced that two hundred and ninety-

one ministers, whose names were printed, had promised to preach once a year on peace. But said the editor:

There are yet other names with some of our agents which have not yet been reported to us, and a great number of ministers preach in favor of the cause of Peace, who have not thought proper to give in their names.

War scares had flamed up toward France, toward England; and the government was busy putting the fear of God into the hearts of the various Indian tribes. In December, 1840, *The Advocate of Peace,* the present American Peace Society periodical, asked—and in the same breath answered—a rather pointed question:

Is the church as a body now reclaimed from her war-degeneracy of ages? Alas! essentially the same sentiments pervade the great mass of both nominal and real Christians throughout the world. Here and there you may find a little Goshen in this vast moral Egypt; but I gather from evangelical writers even in our own country the most ample proof that the Church of Christ is even now gangrened with the war-spirit, and lending her sanction to principles and practices which would render this custom perpetual.

In 1845 the sober Judge William Jay expressed the opinion to the American Peace Society in its annual meeting that "the folly and sinfulness of war and the inconsistency of military ambition with the spirit of Christianity, are themes rarely discussed in our pulpits." About the same time Roswell Rice, Jr., of White Creek, New York, who admitted that he was a professional orator and yet who, as far as I can discover, was never incarcerated for it, opined with hammer-like emphasis that he caught sight of things he would rather not hear told in Gath and Askalon, to say nothing of his native village:

In this luminous day, when the gospel of light beams with such lustre, I behold certain objects strange in appearance. They are those Ministers of the sacred desk, who pretend to preach the gospel of the Son of God, yet are Mahometans at heart—believe in shedding blood—teach their people the same precept; and instead of preaching the doctrine of the Saviour, they are recom-

mending the greatest sin for virtue, that was ever perpetrated by man.[18]

On to Mexico

The time had arrived for the proponents of slavery and expansion to ride across the Rio Grande, abstract a highly desirable slice of territory, and thus contribute to the liberation of the Mexican people and their general improvement. In Boston the parents of the boys sent southward as missionaries of the bullet were given faith in the eternal justice of heaven by their pastor, who thanked God that

> not only have no serious disasters attended the American Arms in Mexico, but that the national feeling of the people had been gratified by victory.[19]

The war passed by. Over in England, the sojourner who was perhaps this country's greatest man of peace, Elihu Burritt, and about whom more is coming in these pages, wrote in his little paper, as if whistling to keep his backbone strictly vertical:

> If every one of the hundreds of thousands of Christian congregations, scattered over the face of the globe, would have a finger, like John the Baptist's, pointing the rebuke of the gospel, with unsparing honesty and unwavering precision, against all the systems of violence and oppression which fill the world with misery, lamentation and woe, the Peace Society, and all the other Societies that have recently celebrated their birthdays in this metropolis, might disband tomorrow; and all the populations of the earth might sing, with a hope that has its hand upon the reality of its aspiration,
>
> "There's a good time coming,
> Wait a little longer." [20]

But there wasn't. What was coming had been predicted by Noah Worcester in his later years with uncanny accuracy. It was foreseen—though the intervention of the War with Mexico detracted from the absolute correctness of the prophecy—by William Ladd, who wrote in *The Calumet* for May-June, 1833:

There is no reason to doubt, that the next war in which this country shall be engaged, will be a civil war—a war of brother against brother, of the son against his father,—and the very materials of war which we have been heaping together will be expended in the work of mutual destruction, and the military spirit which we have so carefully nurtured will be found, at last, to have been employed in whetting our swords for the throats of our brethren.

North and South

It came, and all was chaos. The effect of that war on the peace movement will be brought out in a later chapter. The clergy, both in the North and South, ran true to form.

There was the usual little handful who refused to bless the conflict. The Reverend Benjamin Franklin, an early Middle Western preacher of some fame among the Disciples' denomination, and who had opposed the Mexican War on Christian grounds, held out against the new war also, suffering a heavy loss in the circulation of his paper, *The Christian Review,* being driven to the expedient of discussing war in general with no specific reference to current happenings, and ultimately of stopping even that. There were one or two other ministers, such as the Reverend J. W. McGarvey, who did not hesitate to say boldly in print that whatever happened, their love for people on the opposite side of the fighting lines would not abate.

But these, as the record overwhelmingly shows, were far from typical. For example the Reverend R. L. Stanton, D.D., Professor in the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church at Danville, New York, assured the people—oh, familiar phrases!—that "God is in the war"; and, so far as "our" soldiers are concerned, "His strong arm will give them the victory." Toward England, not without some reason, leaving Christly counsels out of the reckoning, he hurled fiery warnings of a vengeance yet to come. "There are duties to be discharged," he said to the approval of no small section in the churches,

> which can be met only by an exhibition of the national power of the United States towards those who have forever blackened their honor in endeavoring to work our ruin. . . . But this is "venge-

ance," cry the timid and the meek. It is *justice,* we reply; and a justice which will meet the approval of heaven.[21]

A delegation of clergymen actually waited upon President Lincoln and demanded that he wage the war more vigorously.

And this is the conflict whose outbreak followed in less than three months a letter in *The Advocate of Peace* by a too-hopeful optimist who had thus sized up the peace-war status:

> Peace principles make slower progress than we desire, and yet they *do* make progress. Wars grow briefer, and less ferocious, and God seems to be overruling the conflicts of nations so as to further the great end in man, viz., to fill the earth with peace and joy.[22]

The years between then and the War with Spain were once more filled with mingled hope and disillusion. The American Peace Society, which had raged at the pacifists during the Civil War, gave ground somewhat in public influence to the Universal Peace Union, a much more radical body. But in the churches boys' brigades were springing up and on the part of the military and naval professionals there was a grim determination to wring more preparedness out of public apathy.

And yet, so many and so genuine had been the accomplishments of the anti-war campaigners in this period, it seemed, that who could find fault when, in 1895, the feminist and humanitarian, Belva A. Lockwood, before the Triennial Women's Council at Washington, in her turn saw through rosy spectacles? After pointing out the heavy odds faced by the peace societies, she exclaimed:

> But we hold on with unwavering hope in the belief that the day is not distant when the Christian world will be relieved from the curse of war, for even now the Christian ministry are combining with us against this unholy warfare, this slaughter of the innocent and the death of the many for the emolument of the few.[23]

Spain—and the Filipinos

Three short years, and the country was plunged into an unnecessary, execrable, yet popular war, to be followed by

the campaign against the recalcitrant Filipinos, and the emergence of this country as a full-fledged member of the imperialist powers of the world. Once more the ministry did its "duty." Said Ernest Howard Crosby shortly after:

> If you address a miscellaneous audience at the Cooper Institute in New York—an audience of some fifteen hundred, composed neither of blackguards nor gentlemen—and tell them as I have that war is a relic of barbarism which has no business to show itself at the beginning of the twentieth century, they will cheer you to the echo, and scarcely a man will be found to make a protest. I have also spoken to audiences of well educated Christians and I have found them cold. Only once were my hearers unanimous against me without exception, and that was when I was invited to address a meeting of Protestant ministers.[24]

But the optimists, bless them, will not down. In 1901 the Honorable Andrew J. Palm of the Pennsylvania State Legislature was telling the audience at the thirty-eighth anniversary of the Universal Peace Union that "ministers will soon be scarce who apologize for war." [25] And at Richmond, Indiana, eight years later, the Honorable John Watson Foster, Secretary of State under President Benjamin Harrison, expressed the conviction that "the spirit of Christianity is becoming more and more inspired by the teachings of its founder, the Prince of Peace, and in the future the pulpit and the pew will be found largely arrayed against the warlike propensities of the masses." [26]

This newer Christian spirit, unfortunately, lacked time to get up steam. It always does. Just as progress in loving enemies was under way, an enemy appeared. And that was quite enough for most of the churches. Loud in their praiseworthy protests against the war in Europe, their revulsion of feeling once the government called them, was all the greater for the prosecution of the struggle.

Over Here

In his recent book, *A Brass Hat in No-Man's Land* (Cape and Smith) Brigadier General F. P. Crozier of England says

with brutal bluntness that "the Christian churches are the finest blood-lust creators which we have, and of them we made free use."

In Connecticut, Governor Holcomb used the churches to take a census of the state's war materials in terms of men, because, as he put it, "I recognize that the churches in Connecticut count among their members and attendants the people whose influence as a whole, can, perhaps, do more than that of any other body of citizens."

"In flag draped pulpits," as the papers had it, "the pastors of New York, men of peace, sounded the call to arms."

"To hell with Germany," shouted the Reverend Dr. Bustard in Cleveland, to the cheers of his flock; while in New York Dr. Charles A. Eaton fervently declared, "I want to stand before God and tell Him I have walloped the Germans in the face. If you find a man lurking around that looks like a spy take him out and put a bomb under him and blow him straight to the Kaiser—blow him straight to hell."

The Reverend James A. Francis (Baptist) of Los Angeles was moved to say, "I look upon the enlistment of an American soldier or sailor as I do on the departure of a missionary for Burma." Bishop Richard J. Cooke (Methodist) of Helena, Montana, waxed regretful because von Bernstorff was not hanged, and called for conflict until there was an "unconditional surrender." The Reverend Dr. John Roach Straton (Baptist) felt certain that "the very angels of God have been fighting with our soldiers." Rabbi Joseph Silverman was able to see mankind brought nearer to brotherhood by the War than by centuries of religious teaching. The Reverend William Mole Case (Presbyterian) of Eugene, Oregon, discovered that "Christ is at the heart of this war. It is the holiest war the world has ever known." In Waukegan, Illinois the Reverend Howard Ganster (Episcopalian) constructively suggested "the organization of a society for the committing of murder of persons who do not stand up or who leave the building when 'The Star Spangled Banner' is played." The Reverend Billy Sunday (evangelist) separated

the just from the unjust: "You are either a patriot or a blackguard traitor. . . . Stop your damn knocking. I tell you that I am getting sick of it." The Reverend Dr. Albert C. Dieffenbach (Unitarian) explained that "we are in this war because we believe it is a judgment of God that only by force of arms can we save the world. As Christians, of course, we say Christ approves. But would he fight and kill? . . . There is not an opportunity to deal death to the enemy that he would shrink from or delay in seizing!" The Reverend Dr. Newell Dwight Hillis, anxious to be fair-minded about it, stated his willingness to forgive the Germans "just as soon as they are all shot." [27] The writer of this book, though he did not support the War, wrote bitter (and amateurish) verses declaring that never again could the world's children use German toys because they would be covered by bloody fingerprints. It was a time of hysteria, and no one can pretend to have utterly escaped.

Missionary societies accepted special donations from war propagandists and circulated among the clergy thousands of free copies of such books as *The Man Foch,* by Clara E. Laughlin and *The Cross at the Front,* by Thomas Tiplady.

Here and there lone voices were raised in protest. In a Methodist conference one minister even ventured to stand and assert, "If I have to choose between my country and God, I have made up my mind to choose God. I am an American, but a Christian first." But stentorian voices crying "Shame!" and "Traitor!" soon howled him down. Everywhere the imprudent Christians received practically the selfsame treatment.

The War-Time Message of the Federal Council of Churches, adopted in special session assembled at Washington, May 8-9, 1917, included among its genuinely idealistic aims, and quickened no doubt by a wholly laudable love of the boys embarking for the camps, inevitable consideration of morale, and avowed its purpose "to hearten those who go to the front."

The American Branch of the World Alliance for Inter-

national Friendship Through the Churches prefaced a series of hopes for after-war days with the resounding call:

> The Church of Christ in America should prove itself the loyal and efficient servant of the nation at this time of testing.

The Church Peace Union, the League to Enforce Peace—that supreme anomaly of all time—with the coöperation of the World Alliance and the Federal Council's Commission on International Justice and Good Will—established the National Committee on the Churches and the Moral Aims of the War, the first aim being—you are allowed one guess—"to win the war against autocracy." [28]

In the figures of the American Bible Society, 6,678,301 Testaments were distributed among the belligerent forces of all nations; but in that host of active combatants apparently few noticed Jesus' teachings. In fact it seemed, as General Foch well stated, "The Bible is certainly the best preparation that you can give an American soldier about to go into battle to sustain his magnificent ideal and his faith." [29]

And ditto in the battlements back home. As the Interchurch World Movement put it, in a post-war advertisement, "Every officer of the Government with a war message appealed to the churches first of all."

And the churches certainly responded. In Oberlin College, where world peace had been preached heartily for many years, the congregation of the oldest church arose and sang:

> When Tyrant feet are tramping
> Upon the commonweal,
> Thou dost not bid us bend and writhe
> Beneath the iron heel;
> In Thy name we assert our Right,
> By sword or tongue or pen;
> And e'en the headsman's axe may flash
> Thy message unto men.[30]

How fortunate for militarism has been the fact—as witness the songs of the Christian churches through the ages—

that "sword" rhymes with "Lord," whereas "Peace" lacks a deistic or celestial consonant!

What was labeled once by Ernest Howard Crosby as *Militaritis clericalis* had the country in its sway. Little children in the Sunday schools poured out their dimes to build a battleship; and a popular song in the erstwhile quiet basements of spired edifices was the stirring martial ditty, sung with lively rhythm by gay young voices:

> Soldier boy, soldier boy, where are you going,
> Waving so proudly the Red, White, and Blue?
> I go to my country where duty is calling;
> If you'll be a soldier, you may come too.

"What you do, do quickly," admonished a Liberty Loan poster in the first days of the War. And the churches did it; did it all too quickly, it happened, to realize that this was exactly the advice vouchsafed by Jesus, in John 13:26-27, to Judas.

The black and sickening record of those years will not bear close retelling. If it could be obliterated, what a blessing that would be!

But now it can't be wiped out, for one all-impelling reason: the far too meager symptoms of repentance. Few qualms indeed are outwardly displayed by the millions in the churches' memberships. Conjure up a daydream—one of those daydreams it is said that pacifists are fond of—and picture a mad stampede of people to change their ways toward war to coincide more closely with the Man of Love.

And what you really have will be the opposite.

I would not be a prophet of despair. Mine is no voice of chronic pessimism. But a realistic evaluation of the gains—with which I shall deal in more detail in a later chapter—must check them not in terms of war-renouncing individuals, fine as so many of these are, nor yet in terms of pro-peace declarations from on top by churchly bodies. We have to ask ourselves, Are the great bulk of the people in the churches moved by so passionate a mood, so basic a conviction, that they will

hold out long if once again the trumpet blows in Washington? Is there sufficient warrant for the familiar-sounding statement, made lately by a sturdy Christian pacifist, that "there is now a widespread awakening"? Or are we merely at the same old stage within the cycle?

I do not say. I do not know. If another pen may trace, a hundred years ahead as mine has now, the course of Christian policy on war, what words will flow out on the mute and waiting paper?

CHAPTER IV

REPENTANCE, LTD.

AFTERMATH

Have you forgotten yet?
For the world's events have rumbled on since those gagged days,
Like traffic checked awhile at the crossing of city ways:
And the haunted gap in your mind has filled with thoughts that flow
Like clouds in the lit heavens of life; and you're a man reprieved to go,
Taking your peaceful share of Time, with joy to spare.
But the past is just the same—and War's a bloody game . . .
Have you forgotten yet?
Look down, and swear by the slain of the War that you'll never forget.

Do you remember the dark months you held the sector at Mametz—
The nights you watched and wired and dug and piled sandbags on parapets?
Do you remember the rats; and the stench
Of corpses rotting in front of the front-line trench—
And dawn coming, dirty-white, and chill with a hopeless rain?
Do you ever stop and ask, "Is it all going to happen again?"

Do you remember that hour of din before the attack—
And the anger, the blind compassion that seized and shook you then
As you peered at the doomed and haggard faces of your men?
With dying eyes and lolling heads—those ashen grey
Masks of the lads who were once keen and kind and gay?

Have you forgotten yet? . . .
Look up, and swear by the green of the spring that you'll never forget.

(Taken from SIEGFRIED SASSOON's *Picture Show*, by permission of the publishers, E. P. Dutton and Co.)

CHAPTER IV

REPENTANCE, LTD.

Sir Philip Gibbs has voiced a perennial inquiry:

There is one world-wide organization of people, already pledged in the most solemn way to the principles of peace, charity, and human brotherhood, without distinction of class or race. They are under the most sacred obligations to forgive their enemies; they are under a law which forbids them to kill their fellow-men. They are the people of the Christian churches. Is it asking too much that these people should get busy and fulfill their vows and prove the sincerity of their faith?

But since the War they have been getting busy. Some of them, though comparatively small in point of numbers, have turned in frank repentance from the war machine and method, throwing their lives with the utmost abandon into the ranks of radical peace societies. But as far as the overwhelming majority are concerned, they are desperately engaged in following for the most part the identical ways of work for peace that have engrossed the energy of conservative peace workers for a century—the net result of which, in actually abolishing war, need not be told to anybody.

Yet there have been fine services. One of these is the share taken by the religious forces of the country in arousing public opinion for the Washington Conference on the Limitation of Armament; some practical good resulted, even though most of the "limitation" was on near-obsolete naval weapons. Conspicuous and deserving of great praise, is the effective attack on Mobilization Day, later more euphemistically labeled as Defense Day; an attack which buried it, perhaps forever. To the Federal Council of Churches, as well as to the peace societies, should go the credit for this fine maneuver of defense.

Through this same body and the organizations affiliated in the National Council for the Prevention of War, a dangerously lethargic opinion was aroused in 1927 against a threatened war on Mexico, and further serious meddling, already dangerous enough, in China; though in respect to Nicaragua, we did not fare so well. And in regard to military training, the churches have been on the whole responsive. The Methodist General Conference of 1928 not only made an appropriation for peace education; but by a vote of over eight to one registered itself as strongly opposed to compulsory military training in colleges and all military training in high schools. Singularly effective, also, was the prompt protest in the early part of 1928 against the Administration's naval expansion measure, flattening out a program of seventy-four ships to sixteen.

From 1921 to 1924 the chastened post-War mood burned strongly. The Reverend Samuel McCrea Cavert, General Secretary of the Federal Council of Churches, in a report to the Administration Committee of that body, had unequivocally stated:

> There is only one way out. The churches of every nation must teach their people that war is a crime, the utter denial of everything for which the churches stand. They must declare that murder is murder, even when ordered by the state, and that the moral law is as binding on nations as on individuals, that in the relations of nations as of individuals reason and justice, determined by an impartial tribunal, must supplant the resort to naked force, that to the development of agencies of international cooperation must be given the energy that nations have hitherto given to preparation for war.

And the World Alliance asserted in annual convention, 1923:

> The churches of the world should solemnly declare that war as a method of settling disputes is anti-Christian, and therefore every effort to outlaw war and provide judicial substitution will receive their hearty support.

In the National Study Conference on the Church and World Peace, composed of representatives from twenty-eight com-

munions, came a message in December, 1925, which reached the high-water mark of all coöperative Christian peace expression since the War. "We are determined to outlaw the whole war system," said the conferees. Soon a *Syllabus of Topics, Problems, and Suggestions for Study Groups* was prepared by the conference's continuation committee, and for the first time in recent years, so far as I can find, Christians in the churches were given an opportunity to consider fairly two basic alternative attitudes to war: the first alternative, Participation; the second, Non-Participation. Real work had been put in on this study; and the suggestive bibliography, along with a mixture of pacifist and anti-pacifist literature, even included the 1905 reprint of our old friend, David Low Dodge.

But times and seasons change, not always for the better. By the following Armistice Day, something had happened. The Federal Council's message for 1926 threw overboard all such categories as participation or non-participation in warfare. Instead the churches were counseled at the very beginning against "the ineffectual way"—including "merely negative attitudes and policies in opposition to war preparations and to war." The core of the "effectual" way, when reached through a lot of resounding but decidedly ethereal phrases, was none other than that boon companion of the legalistic metaphysicians in the old-line peace societies—the outlawry of "aggressive" war. Shot through with terminology of political caution, asking merely for unilateral and partial disarmament, the difference between this message and the one described before constituted the greatest let-down in the shortest time that has been witnessed since the Armistice.

With this question of "aggressive" war, I propose to deal in a later place. I pause here only long enough to express the sober conviction that, as compared with the principles of Jesus, the elimination of "aggressive" war is on a par with the abolition of "aggressive" gangrene. This plausible will-o-the-wisp still lures the peace societies; but time will show if vision does not, that the laborer for peace who goes romping after this illusion is but one

Who stems a stream with sand,
And fetters flame with flaxen band.

The 1927 statement of the Federal Council, however, was chiefly an appeal for support of the Briand-Kellogg treaties for the renunciation of war "as an instrument of national policy." It was accompanied by a memorial presenting five points of belief: the first, "that war should never again be resorted to by civilized nations as the means for settling disputes or enforcing claims," and the second (the inevitable nullification?) "that war, save for self-defense against actual attack, should be outlawed and declared by the nations to be an international crime."

It is a satisfaction to state that in a message to the churches dated January, 1928, the Council once more definitely, if thereby confusingly, declared that "war, in its spirit and modern practice, is the negation of everything to which the gospel of Jesus bears witness," and further contended that "the Church can be satisfied with nothing less than the complete abolition of (no qualifying adjective!) war." Yet even here, all mention of a possible policy of non-participation in an actual war is conspicuously absent.

Surpassing the first Study Conference on the Churches and World Peace, the second, meeting at Columbus, Ohio, March 6-8, 1929 with one hundred and twenty-four delegates from thirty-five bodies boldly declared:

> We therefore hold that the churches should condemn resort to the war-system as sin and should henceforth refuse, as institutions, to sanction it or to be used as agencies in its support.

And more! For it stated:

> We hold that the churches should support and sustain with moral approval individuals who, in the exercise of their right of conscience, refuse to take part in war or in military training.

A brave, adventurous stand was reiterated against war and military training and armed intervention in Latin America by the 1930 Study Conference. The World Peace Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church has shown a genuine vision in

its work. The Quakers have shown an awakened interest in peace education, and in all denominations a ferment is stirring.

Increasingly the churches are emphasizing the Pact of Paris as a basis for the final outlawry of all war. This emphasis is natural and right. Their danger is that they may withhold support from the further aspects of the war-outlawry and war-abolition program, deluded by a short view and an ungrounded optimism into mistaking partial for complete accomplishment.

Moved and Seconded

At thirty man suspects himself a fool;
Knows it at forty and reforms his plan;
At fifty chides his infamous delay,
Pushes his prudent purpose to resolve,
In all the magnanimity of thought
Resolves and re-resolves; then dies the same.[1]

So, says the cynic in one, with the churches; though cynicism cannot hold out long. Judged, however, by the paving of the road alone, it is hard to tell the approach to the Infernal Regions from that to the City of God. In no sense is that road a one-way street. Turn to this side or the other, the paving is the same: high purposes.

Thus George Odell, in *The Christian Science Monitor,* in 1924:

A survey of the declarations on peace that are being issued by religious bodies shows conclusively that there is a growing conviction among churchmen that war is immoral.

They have come thick and fast, assuredly. They are a mixture, as should be expected. But a rather high percentage of them ring with more than pious platitudes, and one or two are striking for the lengths to which they go.

Most of the resolutions passed soon after the War were only sound and sweetness, signifying nothing. But in 1923 occurred the sensational proceedings of the Student Volunteer Convention at Indianapolis, with its hundreds of young and radical pacifists brought to light, and the reverberations that followed on many a campus. The clutch of the war neurosis

was loosening. A little band of dynamic and highly competent religious pacifists, with unanswerable logic, winged down upon pulpits and upon the platforms of conventions. At church conferences everywhere, peace preëmpted the center of discussions. The cause of peace—and pacifism—was distinctly on the move. Freed from wartime delusions, learning that the skies did not fall even though congregations sometimes got a little nervous when bold words were said in the name of the bold young Nazarene, one religious group after another voiced its war abhorrence in resounding tones.

Make no mistake. There may be serious doubt whether the rank and file behind their representatives would ever go as far in practice or even in theory. And such drastic resolutions as have been adopted had to make their way against strong opposition. No one can rightly say that such and such a church thinks so and so on war.

The standing committee of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church had agreed on a most forthright resolution. It read:

> While recognizing the freedom of the individual member to follow his own conscience, but remembering that the church is the visible expression of Christ in the world, we as an organization, separate ourselves from war and take no part in its promotion.

But, after the memorable fashion of large bodies, the conference as a whole on May 14, 1924, killed off the resolution.

Earlier the Unitarian Ministerial Association, by a postal ballot, had adopted a resolution possibly more challenging. The vote stood ninety-one for and eighty-seven against, with thirty-six not voting upon this declaration:

> Whereas we see that war is the most colossal and ruinous social sin that afflicts mankind today; that it is not only futile but suicidal, and that recognition of this fact is necessary to the continuance of civilization; that it is inherently the defiance of common sense and the denial of common humanity,—we therefore, as ministers of religion and public teachers of morality declare now in time of peace our deliberate determination never to sanction or to participate in a war; we affirm our conviction that churches

as such ought to refuse cooperation with governments in waging war; and we memorialize the American Unitarian Association at its coming session in May to repudiate the entire war system—economic exploitation, imperialism, and militarism—to the end that our fellowship may take an honorable, if not a leading, part among religious bodies in the abolition of war.

What happened to this invitation I scarcely need to say. But the energy behind it did not expire with the recommendation; and the same courageous and spirited minority, in varying proportions, grows in practically all denominations.

Early in 1928 the Central Pennsylvania Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church passed a drastic peace resolution and referred it to the General Conference of that denomination, where it was not received as enthusiastically. It asked its "entire church"

to withdraw completely its sanction of and its participation in the war system, and that it shall determine to throw its entire spiritual and moral energy behind the creation of a system of peace. . . .

Introduced into the North East Ohio Conference of the same denomination by the Reverend Charles B. Ketcham, and adopted on the twenty-eighth of September, 1925, by a large majority, the following is in all probability the most drastic resolution of any thus far passed in this country:

Whereas, by the united judgment of Christian leaders everywhere, war today is recognized as our most colossal and far-reaching social sin; and

Whereas, our own Methodist Episcopal Church has declared through its General Conference that "war is the supreme enemy of mankind";

Therefore, be it resolved by the North East Ohio Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church that the day has come when our Methodist Episcopal Church as a part of the Church Universal, the Body of Christ in the World, should in its corporate capacity refuse to sanction or support any future war.

And, be it further resolved that recognizing the great Protestant principle of individual judgment in matters of personal conduct, we do not presume to pass judgment upon the right of any individual in the event of war, to follow his own enlightened con-

science, whether it takes him into the forces of armed defense or into the ranks of conscientious objectors.

Another notable pronouncement on war is that of the National Council of Congregational Churches, which adopted as part of its *Statement of Social Ideals* in 1925, a section on International Relations, one paragraph of which would make a tremendous difference, if at all adhered to, in another war:

> The church of Christ as an institution should not be used as an instrument or an agency in the support of war.

The Quadrennial Meeting of the Federal Council of Churches at Rochester, New York, in 1928, drew up a suggested article to be added by the constituent bodies to the statement of the Social Ideals of the Churches. It said, "That the Churches stand for: The renunciation of war and the refusal of the Church of Christ as an institution to be used as an instrument or an agency in the support of war." The General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church has definitely called this article to the attention of its congregations, and as a matter of record it has been ratified by the Presbyterian Church in the United States (South). At its 1929 convention the last-named body declared that

> The historic position of our Church is that the function of the Church is purely spiritual. We believe that this principle should apply in time of war as well as in time of peace, and that therefore the Church should never again bless a war or be used as an instrument in the promotion of war.

While they mark a great step forward—for even resolutions have an educative value—such statements are not typical. There have been literally dozens of vague, evasive declarations and a great many in between, which, nevertheless, affirm the incompatibility of war with the religion of Jesus.

Meantime, there is not only a pacifist but a militarist wing in the churches, which loses no opportunity to berate the peace crusaders. The churches as a rule still bless the colors on gala military occasions; many non-student sections of the Y.M.C.A. do little to weaken the affection (now the war is over!) of the

military; army and navy chaplains are still officially recognized by church bodies as legitimate clerical representatives; and the one thing spoken as an "open sesame" and a reassurance by the men of Christ whenever they plead for peace is "though I am no pacifist . . .;" or, it may be, "I am a Christian, *but*. . . ."

How strongly, then, dare honest thinkers lean hope on the best of resolutions?

There is light on this point also, in the history of the early peace societies. Concentrating their efforts on the churches, between 1815 and 1840 in particular, they won their way to a certain status and prestige. Churches in greater numbers gave over their platforms to such men as Worcester and Ladd and others who were scarcely more ahead of their time, alas, than they are of ours. A harvest of pacific resolutions soon resulted. Look at a few and see if they do not seem familiar!

One winter's morning late in 1818 Noah Worcester opened a letter with a blurred return address. The man of peace found that it came from the old town of Springfield, New York. Its message, however, was quite clear. From the "Conference of the Methodist Reformed Church," it declared that

> War and bloodshed have had their rise and support too much among professors of religion [i.e. adherents]. But we trust and believe that the day is near—if it has not already come—when the children of the same family will no more join in the diabolical practice of murdering one another, because required so to do by unsanctified national rulers. . . . Therefore, we will from henceforth consider ourselves a Peace Society.[2]

"Every church ought itself to be a peace society," said the Reverend Peter Ainslee, a modern pacifist, not long ago.[3]

At a meeting of Vermont Congregational and Presbyterian ministers in 1820 it was voted that Christians had too long been under the power of the war appeal, and ought to give support to peace societies.[4]

And now see how they stiffen up! Thomas S. Grimké's address at New Haven in 1832—which, incidentally, made William Ladd a thorough pacifist—had had a widespread influ-

ence; and too, the early members of the peace societies had been given time for deeper thinking.

A conference of Baptist ministers at Boston, 1832, pronounced *"all war* utterly inconsistent with the spirit of the Gospel." [5]

By the Lincoln County Conference in Edgecomb, Maine, in 1833, it was declared that "we consider the practice of war as inconsistent with the spirit of the principles, and the millennial triumphs, of the Gospel."

But in the same year, by the New England Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, it was

> Resolved, that as a body of Christian ministers, they feel themselves called upon to record their solemn judgment, that the waging of all offensive war is in direct opposition to the benign spirit of the religion of Christ.

Let no conservative peace campaigner fail to note that safety valve, *"offensive* war."

At the same time a smaller body, the York (Maine) Conference, was joining in with those who counted war contradictory to the religion of Jesus; as also was the case with the newly formed peace society in Cincinnati, and another in the Bowdoin Street Church of Boston.

The resolutions of a hundred years or so ago were not much less radical than those of now. They were not useless, certainly. In the task of building up a public opinion that helped prevent a threatened war with France and another with Britain at about this time, they probably had a share.

And yet, one may close his eyes and in imagination see the cavalry of Scott crashing through the Mexican cactus in 1847; the Blue and the Gray battering each other's ranks to pieces on the fields of Gettysburg; the weak ships of Cervera's squadron going down in Santiago Harbor and the natives of Luzon writhing under the "water cure"; the mud-encrusted doughboys slaughtering and being butchered by the Germans at Château Thierry, in the Argonne Forest, and at St. Mihiel—men against whom they had no personal enmity and with whom

they shared the experience of being victimized with lies of wartime poison pens; and at most times in between our major conflicts, around the Everglades, along the Mississippi and on the Western Plains, blue-coated men in deadly war with copper-hued Americans, a series of campaigns which William Penn's warm vision had proved to be unnecessary.

At the anniversary meeting of the Windham County (Connecticut) Peace Society in 1832 a new song was sung, which had been composed (doubtless in a hurry!) by one of the members. Two lines of it posed a question:

> Christians! can you idly slumber
> While this work of hell goes on? [6]

There rests the riddle of the future. It was a former chief of staff in the Army, General Tasker H. Bliss, who, after the World War, hammered home this stern admonishment:

> The responsibility is entirely upon the professing Christians of the United States. If another war like the last should come, they will be responsible for every drop of bloodshed.[7]

How widely—and how deeply—do the Christian churches see it in that light? It is always possible that we may find out much sooner than we think. In the test of a crisis the future reaction from the stained-glass followers of love's great teacher, is like that outraged lad who lies at Arlington: *"Known But to God."*

CHAPTER V

TWIN WARS: "AGGRESSIVE" AND "DEFENSIVE"

The right way to resist tyranny is not to kill the tyrant, but to refuse to coöperate in his tyranny.—A. FENNER BROCKWAY, M.P.

CHAPTER V

TWIN WARS: "AGGRESSIVE" AND "DEFENSIVE"

At no time in the history of the peace movement has it been undivided over the question of defensive war. To-day the cleavage is as sharp as ever.

"Personally," says the Reverend S. Parkes Cadman, "I make a differentiation between wars of defense and wars of aggression." [1]

"If you get rid of aggression," declared Lord Robert Cecil during his visit to the United States, "you get rid of war." [2]

The influence of the conservative peace societies has been thrown behind the "outlawry of aggressive war." Though the term "aggressive war" does not appear in the Covenant, the League of Nations has not yet explicitly disavowed the sanctions of armed force implicit in its articles, to be hurled overwhelmingly at a nation guilty of "aggression." The Locarno treaties are built along substantially the selfsame lines. Even the original Levinson-Borah plan for the Outlawry of War, while relying only on the sanction of public opinion against a nation breaking the law by going to war, in effect allowed "defensive" war. The Pact of Paris is practically on the selfsame status. The great bulk of the peace movement accepts the differentiation between wars of "defense" and wars of "aggression."

There is nothing new in this theoretical distinction.

Early in 1814, the Reverend John Lathrop of the New Brick Church of Boston so pleased his congregation by a sermon that they arranged to have it printed. It was a *Discourse on the Law of Retaliation.* It went pretty far—for a war year; but Dr. Lathrop still had one foot in the war system. Said he:

The true subjects of the Prince of Peace will be the last men on earth to blow the trumpet of war. They will never take the sword but in defense of rights highly important, and such as are essential to their safety and happiness.

In thirty-three years "they" were, as all men know, waging a bitter war of conquest to the southward. "They"—for all of these battling invaders from the United States were still (if the clergy's word be taken for it) "true subjects of the Prince of Peace."

In the same year of 1814, however, David Low Dodge was hammering away with stern realism and appealing to the teachings of his religion:

> The fact is, however, that no man can, on gospel principles, draw a line of distinction between offensive and defensive war so as to make the former a crime and the latter a duty. . . .[3]

How little did Dodge appreciate the inventiveness of legalistic minds! Let him go on:

> But suppose this principle adopted by governments. Could they prosecute war while they left every individual in the free exercise of his conscience to judge whether such war was offensive or defensive and to regulate his conduct accordingly? Would it be possible for governments to carry on war if they depended for support on the uncertain opinion of every individual? No; such a procedure would extinguish the vital strength of the war and lay the sword in the dust. The fact is well known, and monarchs declare war and force their subjects to support it. The majority in republican governments demand and enforce obedience from the minority. . . .
>
> Hence we see that the acknowledged principles of defensive war are the vital springs of most of the wars that agitate and desolate our world. The pretended distinction between offensive and defensive war is but a name. All parties engaged in war proclaim to the world that they are fighting in defense of their rights, and that their enemies are the aggressors; while it may be impossible for man to decide which are most in the wrong.

But the peace movement as a whole could not agree with Dodge. "The truth," declared the Lady in Shaw's *Man of Destiny,* "is the one thing nobody will believe."

In Boston, Noah Worcester's quill scratched across the manuscript of his *Solemn Review* the plausible sentence:

> As soon as offensive wars shall cease, defensive wars will, of course, be unknown.

And the peace movement, turning its back on Dodge and his followers, started its hundred years' campaign against *aggressive* war.

"So long as defensive war is admitted," urged the Reverend Samuel Whelpley in 1818, "all wars can easily be proved to be defensive, by a system of martial logic." A good phrase—"martial logic." Through its entire history, the peace movement has used that logic; no better compliment has ever been paid to the power of tradition over human thought.

Also in 1818, Andrew Ritchie Esq. delivered a conservative address to the Massachusetts Peace Society. It was the Society's third anniversary. Said Ritchie, to the approval of many listeners:

> When we see the world filled with nations which are restrained from aggression because it will be opposed by force, we ought to consider, whether we promote peace by denying the use of force. Should we not increase the temptation to hostilities, by removing the principal ground of apprehension from the mind of the aggressor?

There's martial logic for you! And yet that address of Ritchie's, spoken one hundred and ten years ago, could be used by some of our most active peace workers to-day without the change of anything but the obsolete punctuation. The elimination of "aggressive" or "offensive" war has always been the preoccupation of the peace movement's "best minds." Channing himself, along with President Kirkland of Harvard and three others, prepared an address on war, on behalf of a convention of Congregational ministers. You can guess what they said in the course of a really passionate denunciation of war; but here it is, exactly:

> Unquestionably there is a wide difference between offensive and defensive war. But every war is offensive, at least on one part;

and if offensive war can be prevented, defensive war will of course be superseded.

Sounds reasonable, does it not? Nearly everybody thought so. A few years later, one of the tracts of the American Peace Society presented a series of forceful quotations against war, selected from the words of ancient and modern seers, comprising "eminent pagans," "warriors," "statesmen," "philosophers," "men of letters," and "theologians." In summing up, the compiler asked his readers to

> mark how far the extracts above go against war. They do not directly touch the vexed question concerning wars purely defensive; but they are strong against the whole war system.[4]

The whole war system? Achilles had his heel; and the peace movement has had this pet distinction without a difference.

In 1838 a resolution favoring a Congress of Nations was introduced in the Massachusetts State Legislature. One of its clauses read as follows:

> Resolved, That offensive war is incompatible with the true spirit of Christianity.

The peace forces have never obtained a real Congress of Nations. But they have to-day a League of Nations based on the same conception, essentially, as manifested in the early resolution.

And in spite of the fact that the American Peace Society's plan for a Congress of Nations did not contemplate the use of punitive force against an aggressor, and relied on public opinion —as does modern outlawry—William Ladd, as General Agent, and George C. Beckwith, as Secretary, in their introduction to the volume *Prize Essays on the Congress of Nations,* issued in 1840, took almost the identical position developed by modern outlawrists: the position that in this matter the question of defense is neither germane nor of very great importance. Said Ladd and Beckwith:

> With the question of the lawfulness of defensive war, or its consistency with the spirit of the gospel, these Essays have nothing to do. It is entirely irrelevant to the subject.

All this, if truth were told, was something of a diplomatic gesture. For Ladd had gone through a change, prior to this, from a halfway to a radical pacifism. In 1834 he had frankly pointed out that change:

I am well aware that the American Peace Society does not decide on the lawfulness of defensive wars; but the longer I have studied the subject, the more I am convinced that all war is unlawful for a Christian, though I must confess that I was long unwilling to come to that conclusion.[5]

When President Allen of Bowdoin College wrote for *The Calumet* a series of articles justifying defensive war, and repeating the old, old "martial logic"—"if offensive wars were abolished, there would be no need to agitate the question of defensive war"—Ladd replied, with sympathy but with no budging from the view arrived at through long thought:

It is the most forcible defence of the right of defensive war I have ever seen. In short, it reasons in the same manner as I myself reasoned, though much more forcibly, for many years after I was an advocate of peace; and it is the same manner in which many of the friends of the peace society now reason.[6]

How strong the radical minority in the peace movement finally became, will be related in another chapter. But it is significant to note here that one year later, 1835, Ladd said in the columns of *The Calumet:*

The majority of those who conduct the affairs of the American Peace Society are decidedly opposed to all war, offensive and defensive.[7]

It was in 1836 that Professor Upham made his moving appeal to the peace movement to abjure the old distinction. With page on page of the best argument ever written up to that time, he called definitely on the peace societies for a shift of basis to the more radical position:

So long as we admit that defensive wars are allowable, on Christian principles, so long we grant, for all practical purposes, everything which the advocates of war wish.[8]

To many came the new conviction; but not to all or even a majority of the rank and file. In my own copy of Upham's book is written this comment, brown with age but none the less emphatic as it reels across the margin:

If all the world would adopt the principle, *never* to be aggressive in war, war would never come. This would as effectually secure peace, as to adopt the principle that defensive war is never justifiable. Never *declare* war.

But even the conservative Judge William Jay, President of the American Peace Society, son of the illustrious diplomat, John Jay, in 1842 expressed the opinion that

The last plea that can be urged in behalf of war, is that it is indispensable in self-defence. To this we reply that every war is professedly defensive, while scarcely any is so in fact.[9]

And in 1843, before the American Peace Society, Andrew Preston Peabody—then thirty-two and as yet unmoderated by a Harvard professorship and the mass pressure of the Civil War—asserted succinctly:

I know that we have been accustomed to speak and hear of defensive wars; but there are no such wars.

In 1847 Joshua P. Blanchard was writing to *The Christian Citizen,* Elihu Burritt's paper, to say:

Vain is the deluding pretence that war is ever made for the defence of right or the enforcement of justice.

Then came the war against Mexico and soon the internecine war of 1861 to 1865. On the verge of the bitter sectional conflict the Reverend Samuel J. May, an abolitionist and (then) pacifist as well, published an address before the American Peace Society as delivered May 28, 1860, in which he said:

You would remind me perhaps, that the moralists of no Christian nation sanction offensive, aggressive wars—that it is only for the sake of self protection that they would have their several nations keep themselves armed; and only *defensive* wars that any of them would justify. Ah! this is one of the chief delusions

which have cheated the so-called Christian world of the truth as it is in Jesus, on this paramount subject.

May, of course, found bitter opposition. He sent this address, as others, to Edward Everett Hale, who was later (long after the Civil War) to be called "the grand old man of the peace movement," and wrote in pencil across the front of it, significantly, "And is this also 'All Bosh'?"

Scarcely had the country caught its breath after the slaughter when the Franco-Prussian War broke out across the water; and those who had led public opinion here on behalf of the Civil War burst forth in violent denunciation of the European conflict. Henry Ward Beecher, conspicuous among them, qualified his condemnation of war by telling his people on Sunday morning, July 30, 1870:

> All the sentimentality about not using force, where force is the only thing that can be used, is surplusage and waste. I do not believe in using force if you can help it, but I do believe in using it when you cannot help it.

Clarifying his position a couple of years later, he returned to chant the well-known theme:

> Now, I do not take the ground that all defensive wars are wrong. I do not think they are. I do not believe that the use of physical force to maintain the great moral ends of justice, liberty, and national life can yet be dispensed with. The time is coming when it can be dispensed with, but that time has not come yet.[10]

Nor will it ever come, so long as war is confused or glossed over by the non-analogous term "physical force." In that very same year, the Peace Association of Friends in America was circulating in this country a reprint of a London tract. It said:

> Is it not . . . a strong presumption against the soundness of a principle such as that on which you take your stand, who are the advocates of only defensive war, that it cannot in any case be acted upon without leading by a necessary sequence, as inevitable as fate, to all the iniquities and atrocities of the entire system?

In 1893 the penitent powder maker, Alfred Nobel, scarcely realizing how trite his idea was, wrote that if all states in true

solidarity would agree to turn against the first aggressor, war would become impossible. The odor of guncotton, obviously, still clung about his nostrils.

So raged the argument from side to side, in far too frequent controversy for recording here. Suffice it further to say that when the World War cut its red gash in humanity's side, and the great majority of leaders in the peace movement were busily engaged in leading this country into the War, there was the Reverend John Haynes Holmes to raise the query that simply will not down:

> Go through all the history of the world—study all the persecutions, outrages, slaughter, martydoms, wars—search out the motives that determined these tragedies of blood and iron. And I venture to prophesy that, in every case, it will be found that the injury was wrought because some man, or institution, or country, felt it necessary to defend something which was assailed and in danger, therefore, of destruction. What indeed is defense after all, but aggression from the other point of view?[11]

Yet even the World War, supreme example of a conflict the one aggressor in which a multitude of experts have not yet been able to determine, did little to deter the peace movement from its pursuit of this plausible will-o'-the-wisp. The clergy, the international legal lights, and the statesmen of Europe, unite with many of our best-known workers for peace to vociferate the old refrain: "Get rid of aggressive war and you get rid of all war." To-day they stand in agreement on this point with Colonel P. S. Bond, advocate of heavy preparedness programs, believer in leaving the work of peace-making entirely up to the Creator, who declared his conviction in a militaristic pamphlet issued in 1925, that

> We shall have peace when the aggressor among nations is as certain to encounter overwhelming force as would be an aggressor among the states of the American Union.[12]

A certain element of humor is not lacking in this alliance! I do not know where in the record of the peace movement it can be excelled, with one exception. The Massachusetts Peace

Society, as we have seen, affirmed the necessity of differentiating between offensive and defensive wars, giving the latter, even if reluctantly, its blessing. Yet when its committee of inquiry, in 1820, investigated as painstakingly as possible the causes of all the major wars from that time back to the days of Constantine—two hundred and eighty-six wars in all—and classified "assailants" and "defendants," they could report not one true defensive conflict! It is as easy for statesmen to determine the exact responsibility for an aggression as for moralists to fix the precise dimensions of a sin. More naïve than most, but expressive of the common point of view, was the Honorable James Williams, author of a mid-century book, *The South Vindicated:*

> As for a war of aggression, we will never wage it, except in self-defense.

The attempt to suppress "aggressive" wars merits comparison with the proverbial search of "a blind man in a dark room looking for a black cat that isn't there."

International Blind-Man's Buff

The word "war" may mean either a state of hostility or actual combat. In current usage no clear distinction is made; even among writers on international law the two meanings are seldom completely differentiated.

Says John Bassett Moore:

> Much confusion may be avoided by bearing in mind that by the term war is not meant the mere employment of force, but the existence of a legal condition of things in which rights are or may be prosecuted by force. Thus, if two nations declare war one against the other, war exists though no force whatever may as yet have been employed. On the other hand, force may be employed by one nation against another, as in the case of reprisals, and yet no state of war may arise. In such a case there may be said to be an act of war, but no state of war.[13]

By taking a clear term such as "act of war," and distinguishing a mere legal war status from such actual violence of combat,

it is possible to draw a sharp distinction of great importance to this present discussion.

There may be theoretically a defensive war, but practically there can be no defensive warfare. There may be a status of defense, but there can be no defensive acts of war.

The distinction is valid. And because it is valid, the peace movement is unrealistic when it confines its labors to the abolition of "aggressive war."

I

No uniformly reliable definition of an aggressor nation is possible. Until recently, efforts to supply a definition stigmatized as the aggressor an invading nation. On this basis so distinguished a jurist as Professor Moore has conceded the impracticability of determining the aggressor.[14] Invasions, or declarations of war, do not necessarily warrant the allocation of all the guilt to the invader or the nation taking the initiative. Wars are not isolated phenomena; they originate in policies, usually a culmination of cumulative reprisals, the true origins of which are often impossible to ascertain.

Let any man seek fairly to determine any country which has a reasonable, complete claim to Alsace-Lorraine, or for that matter, almost any piece of irredentist territory. Many of these have changed hands so often, with changes of language and cultures, that no truly just settlement can be made. As a matter of sad fact, there is in justice no criterion for possession. Possession is all ten points of the law. Even forced signatures to war settlements can never be questioned on grounds of injustice, as between individuals in private affairs.

It is *policy* that warrants condemnation often as much as an open state of war. By policy, sometimes without actual conflict, as much injustice, as much cruelty, may be inflicted as in warfare. The blockade of Russia following the Bolshevik revolution was an act fully as cruel and destructive as many a minor war, yet it does not fit the terms of this inadequate definition. Hallam, in his *Constitutional History of England* was aware of just such influences of policy when he pointed out that

The aggressor in war is not the first that uses force, but the first who renders force necessary.

Again, the nations of the world to-day whatever be their faults do not reside behind impassable walls. Frontiers are traversible; given a border difficulty, even at best it is hard to tell whence came the first marauders. And given a border with mobilized forces drawn up on either side, it is often impossible to fix responsibility for any invasion followed by conflict. As a matter of fact, it is not only impossible at the time, but frequently impossible forever. Where is the man or the men who can state with certainty the place along the French frontier where either the French or the Germans crossed in 1914, and which did the first crossing? And even so, of what importance was the crossing in comparison to the infinitely greater significance of the policies which had been breeding war on both sides of that border for more than a generation?

The violation of demilitarized zones, the commission of a so-called overt act, the violation of treaties—these are often put forward as bases for the determination of an aggressor. They are sufficiently reliable tests to fit certain cases, to apply with clarity to some conceivable wars; but they fit too seldom to constitute any safe basis for the selection of a guilty nation against which other nations ought to turn their scorn if not their joint forces. The weakness of these tests becomes apparent when their practical operation is frankly faced.

The demilitarization of land areas may accomplish much to ease the tension between suspicious possessors of contiguous territory. Article Nine of the rejected Geneva Protocol provided that a violation of the rules governing a demilitarized zone should be deemed tantamount to a resort to war. When the existing demilitarized areas are examined, however, it will be seen that usually they consist of territories having international economic importance, yet for which none of the involved nations would desire to risk a war; but which, if a war for some other purpose were undertaken, they would scarcely then hesitate to use for military or naval considerations.[15] The aid

given to a peaceful mood by these unfortified areas, such as Luxembourg, the shores of the Dardenelles and Bosphorus, our far Pacific Islands, et cetera, should not be minimized. Yet it is sheer folly to believe that if a war policy is decided on, any nation involved in the non-militarization of such zones would feel obligated to respect them.

And who by objective criteria can define an overt act? Nations sometimes go to war about an act which they label as overt, and sometimes fail to go to war. An overt act, if defined practically on the basis of experience, is simply a hostile act which will not be tolerated without war. Sometimes it is cleverly provoked. Where the line is drawn depends, actually, only on circumstances, public opinion, or other unrevealed governmental desiderata. As a test by which to determine an aggressor the overt act criterion is all but worthless.

Numberless treaties have been broken without the consequence of war. The treaty of 1778 between the United States and France, by which this country was to be an ally in any defensive war, was violated when England and France joined battle: our refusal to give France even non-military aid was based on the ground that although England had started the ball rolling by expelling the French ambassador, France had really provoked the war.

Is it sensible or prudent to stigmatize every breach of a treaty as an act of aggression? Bear in mind what treaties often are:

> So long, however, as fraud and violence are permissible factors in the conclusion of treaties; so long as mere superior power and the threat of its use are legitimate instrumentalities in exacting submission to the harshest terms, it is absurd to speak of "the faith of treaties"; many of them, in fact, deserve no more to be fulfilled than a promise extorted from an innocent pedestrian by a nocturnal highwayman.[16]

It all depends. And because it all depends—depends on the particular case in point, and depends on whether hostilities result—the uniform identification of treaty-breaking with utter international depravity would not be feasible. It would often

be unjust, unrealistic, and productive of reprisals and upheavals out of all proportion to the nature of the offense. Not always, to be sure; but often enough to make this test inadequate in fastening the onus of aggression.

Even here, the relation is close between non-fortification and policy, between overt acts and policy, between treaty-observance and policy.

And policies, in the last analysis, are based on economic interest. Lord Ponsonby has failed to find a single substantial war in the last hundred years that was fought over the violation of a treaty. Nor are territorial considerations so simple as they seem to those who assign all war guilt by the moral arbitrament of acreage. As a matter of fact, nations seldom fight to protect their soil as such from invasion; most of the wars that tear the human race apart are never fought "in defense of hearth and home." As Norman Angell once pointed out, England, for a supreme example, has fought defensive wars during the last nine hundred years in all quarters of the globe but one—England.[17]

Said an editorial in *The World's Work* for April, 1927:

> With our trade spread throughout the world and the world's gold in our pockets, it is more essential than ever that we should have our military establishment prepared not only for the protection of our interests in case of war between two other powers, but also for protection against aggression by other powers or groups of powers.
>
> We do not fight alone to defend our land, our homes, our loved ones, if indeed we ever do. We fight to defend our national interest; and our national interest knows no bounds save those of interplanetary space.

The Aggressor As a Non-Arbitrating Nation

In recent years an attempt has been made to define an aggressor differently. As put by Father John A. Ryan of the National Catholic Welfare Council, an earnest voice for peace, it runs like this:

I think that aggressive war should be defined and also, legitimate self-defense. The only workable definition of the former is war made by a state which refuses to submit its case to arbitration.[18]

That is to say, a state which goes to war without arbitration *after having agreed to do so.*

Early in 1928 sixty persons of prominence in public affairs published a definition of aggression:

The aggressor nation in war is the nation that, having failed to settle its dispute by conference, conciliation, arbitration, appeal to judicial procedure or other peaceful means, initiates an attempt to settle it by war. (If preferred, the words, "in violation of its treaty obligations" may be inserted before the word "initiates.")

These proposals in essence go back to our old friend the League to Enforce Peace from which Woodrow Wilson derived many of the ideas in favor of military sanctions written into the League of Nations' Covenant in Articles X and XVI. The Executive Committee after adopting its program in the spring of 1915 issued an interpretation of Point 3 in that program. It read as follows:

The signatory powers shall jointly employ diplomatic and economic pressure against any one of their number that threatens war against a fellow signatory without first having submitted its dispute for international inquiry, conciliation, arbitration or judicial hearing, and awaited a conclusion, or without having in good faith offered so to submit it. They shall follow this forthwith by the joint use of their military forces against the nation if it actually goes to war, or commits acts of hostility against another of the signatories before any question arising shall be dealt with as provided in the foregoing.[19]

As earlier pointed out, the threat of such joint armed force in the background is the original basis of the League of Nations' program for security, though the League has not defined what constitutes aggression. It is the underlying basis of the Locarno treaties which define aggression essentially as the failure to arbitrate. The Pact of Paris leaves to each signatory the decision as to what action shall be taken against a violator of the Treaty; force is neither mandatory nor barred. In

short, the world's existing peace machinery in varying degree depends on using the possibility of armed action against an aggressor.

But the attempt thus to define the aggressor is substantially as futile as the definition based on invasion. It breaks down in theory and will most certainly break down in practice unless nations change in the next few decades more than may reasonably be expected.

Nations are still bound by balance-of-power alliances and commitments, maintained despite the League and Pact. All Europe is chained by a network of treaties and defensive agreements, some known and some unknown, most of them executed by the members of the League in direct violation of its spirit and some in contradiction to the letter. Such, to cite one example only, is the political-military treaty consummated in secret among France, Poland and Roumania against Hungary, Russia, Germany and Bulgaria and revealed by accident in 1926. *The Manchester Guardian* stated, coincidently with the treaty's publication, "Of all the four possible enemies named, three are fellow-members of the League of Nations, one a fellow-member of the Council, and statesmen of Warsaw and Bucharest calmly envisage the likelihood of a sudden attack being made by any or all of them."

In any future war, of Europe certainly, it will be even harder than before to limit the conflict to a war between two countries. And there will not be one aggressor but a group of aggressors, acting with full common knowledge. Try to settle if you can who will be the aggressor on the theory of two involved powers! Especially when the body to decide in most cases must be the Supreme Council of the League.

How will the Council perform this task? Section 7 of Article XV of the Covenant reads as follows:

> If the Council fails to reach a report which is unanimously agreed to by the members thereof, other than the Representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute, the Members of the League reserve to themselves the right to take such action as they shall consider necessary for the maintenance of right and justice.

Such action need not be military, and the Council can only recommend. But what it will be unless real disarmament proceeds with great rapidity, unless the policy of regional defensive-offensive alliances is speedily foregone, unless there is soon apparent a more unselfish economic spirit than manifest hitherto, does not require a great flight of imagination.

Boycotting the Aggressor

Of a piece with this effort to define aggression is the plan, sponsored in England by Mr. Henry Wickham Steed and in the United States by Professor James T. Shotwell, to have the United States ban the shipment of arms and goods in another war to a nation branded as an aggressor. This project has been endorsed at some of our peace conferences, notably the International Good-Will Congress held at St. Louis in November, 1927, and the Third Conference on the Cause and Cure of War in Washington, in January, 1928.

Infinitely more salutary and potent as a war deterrent would be the serving of a ban on all participants in another war. But our refusal of the more conservative project at Washington—for informally it was immediately snubbed—was on no such high ground. Primarily it was turned down because a great many influential members of the Senate shared the view of President Coolidge, whom the papers quoted, guardedly as usual:

> . . . he was said to take the position that the United States has certain commercial and other rights that might not be best served under such an agreement.[20]

To the credit of the House Committee on Foreign Relations be it said that when Mr. Theodore E. Burton introduced a resolution to ban the shipment of war materials (unless permitted by Congress—there's the joker!) to a nation held by the President to be an aggressor, the Committee finally changed the resolution, and it was reintroduced by Mr. Burton on January 18, 1928 (with the joker still retained but otherwise significantly modified) "to prohibit the exportation of arms, mu-

nitions or implements of war to any nation which is engaged in war with another." A similar resolution was introduced by Representative Hamilton Fish, Jr.

Thus far, however, neither branch of Congress has seen fit to deal seriously with so realistic and important a resolution.

Tied up in many people's minds with the idea of directing an overwhelming force against an aggressor, is the conception of armies as police. Few fallacies so palpably without foundation gain currency and continue so long to confuse popular thought. An international police force, acting under the direction of a coördinated central delegated authority, might have some justification and use when employed against uncivilized tribes; though it is not the uncivilized but the civilized countries that menace world peace. While the nations are wedded to this aggressor ideology, any use of force will be in actuality not the exercise of police power, but open, unrestrained and ruthless war, no more to be checked at will, once started, than a prairie fire.

The first step taken within any country to insure the functioning of the police is the total disarmament of its citizens. When the nations cease to carry pistols and daggers on their hips and up their sleeves, the conception of an international police force will perhaps cease to be purely academic.[21]

An Ethereal Distinction

Underlying the reasons adduced thus far against the definition of an aggressor is the fact that aggression depends less on whom than on what. Variously, all of the plans for the definition of the aggressor nation rely upon such phrases as "a country *going to war* without submitting its case to arbitration"; or "a country commencing *hostilities,*" or "a country *making an attack.*" None of these schemes, however, define adequately what truly constitutes an attack, or hostilities, or going to war.

Does mobilization fall under these heads? If it does, it is entirely outside the strict limits of the definition. If it does not, what person who knows anything whatever of modern wars

and the circumstances of their beginning will venture to say precisely where mobilization ends and war commences? Let the reader for himself lay hold of the material now available on the origins of the World War, and chart the precise points at which each of the nations actually "began hostilities," "went to war," or "started to attack"! He will have at least as many different points charted as there were participating nations, from the assassination of the Archduke by Serbian nationalists to the secret agreement between Italy and the Allies.

If these definitions cannot stand up as theory, may they not perhaps work better when it comes to practice? Few who live in this world and study the ways of governments, even though of robust faith in human institutions, could find any substantial evidence to warrant such a hope.

The distinction between aggression and defense in terms of war is as ethereal as it is arbitrary; and the attempts to write it down in the law of nations is a delusive over-simplification.

II

There can be no defensive warfare or "war for law" without aggression. The military experts know this well. What advocate of the abolition of "aggressive" war ever drew fire from the militaristic wing of our population? What military leader ever acknowledged playing the part of an aggressor?

Napoleon, before his death, asserted that he had never waged any other than strictly defensive wars. Earlier than that by far, measured in terms of bloodshed, the French National Assembly in the constitution of September 3, 1791, avowed an abandonment of wars of conquest.

As far back as 1833, a writer in the American Peace Society's journal was reminding his readers, "It is a favorite military maxim that the most effectual means of defending a country is to carry hostilities into that of the enemy."

In a drive for Congressional appropriations in 1861—just before the Civil War broke out—Colonel R. Delafield, acting as the War Department's "official spokesman," published a

huge volume on *The Art of War in Europe.* After pleading for the fortification of our coasts, he says,

> . . . then with our resources we may feel secure and with other means at command, fit out armaments to meet our enemy on their own coasts, the most advantageous means of annoying them and adding to our own protection.

The late Rear Admiral Mahan exercised a tremendous influence on world public opinion relative to the importance of sea power, and fathered a number of significant naval policies. Among his contributions to United States naval progress, according to a Navy booklet issued in 1927, was "the abandonment of a strictly defensive naval policy."

Rear Admiral Bradley A. Fiske, another zealous advocate of gigantic preparedness, makes it tactically plain in his book, *The Art of Fighting* (1922) that

> . . . unless the defendant does at some time act offensively, he will surely be vanquished.

Consider the War Department's Training Regulations on the subject, dated September 3, 1921:

> The object to be attained by training is to enable the Army to wage offensive warfare. While training must cover certain phases of defensive doctrine and police doctrine, the Army must definitely understand that these are only means to the definite end —offensive warfare—and every individual in the military service must be imbued with the spirit of the offensive.

Ex-Senator James W. Wadsworth, always a keen student of military matters and a dependable booster for preparedness, led the fight against the treaty banning poison gases, in December, 1926, which forced that treaty back into committee. He stated quite frankly, as one of his reasons for favoring the use of poison gas, that it constituted a valuable offensive weapon and that it is necessary, for real defense, to take the offensive.

Major-General Charles P. Summerall, Chief of Staff, in discussing the war of the future at the opening exercises of the War College, in 1927, warned the specialists in destruction,

Whether the enemy strikes on our mainland or overseas, we must pour into the theatre of operations and into the battle line.[22]

What did the general mean by "overseas?" He might have meant, with prophetic insight, almost anywhere. Three days later, at Providence, Rhode Island, he elaborated his thesis:

We are prone to overlook the number of campaigns waged by American armed forces on foreign soil—the war with Tripoli, the expedition into Canada in the War of 1812, the War with Mexico, the Spanish War, the Philippine Insurrection, the Boxer Rebellion, expeditions to Haiti, Santo Domingo, and Nicaragua, the Vera Cruz expedition of 1914, the Punitive Expedition into Mexico in 1916, and the World War, during which the American flag was seen in France, Belgium, Italy, Northern Russia, Siberia, and finally in Luxemburg and on the Rhine with the Army of Occupation. . . . We seldom realize that, as a nation, we have since our birth 150 years ago been forced into armed conflict against more foreign nations than have either France or Germany during the same period.[23]

It hardly seems necessary to point out that in all these campaigns, and the ones on our own home territory also, we have fought after the sound tactics of defense. That is to say, by aggression.

The weapons were no less lethal, the lying no less prevalent, the hatred no less drummed up for its deadly purpose. *The Calumet* in 1834 asked a pertinent question,

Can a war of any kind be carried on without warlike weapons, swords, muskets, and cannon? But these are all *offensive* and *defensive* weapons. The shield and the helmet are weapons of defence; yet where is the defensive soldier who would think himself sufficiently panoplied with no other implements than these?[24]

Said the circular letter of the American Peace Society in 1828,

When we shall hear of a nation's waging defensive war without committing aggression, we may perhaps, withhold our censure; and when we shall see a defensive war *carried on on Christian principles,* we shall certainly approve of it.

There have been wars waged by great powers against weak

peoples, who have sometimes fought back. For many years to come, under the spread of imperialism to the less developed portions of the earth, we shall witness such disgraceful high-handedness. Even in these cases, however, from the first moment when the oppressed people resort to the war method in defense, defense exists no more except as a euphemism. It is aggression from then forward, on both sides of the conflict, but with one side capable of employing it to immensely better advantage than the other—by whom, as a matter of fact, the use of war is proving of less and less practical value irrespective of its awful cost in devastation and in life.

No matter how the battle goes, war is always the winner.

III

Defensive war, so-called, does not defend. The militarists are right: the only sound war-way to defend a homeland—apart from the interests for which wars are usually fought—is by offensive action, by carrying the war into the enemy's preserves. Once an aggressive expedition of this character has failed and the enemy strikes our shores, we may turn against him every device of destructive science, every artifice of propaganda, and yet from the time war begins, we have failed in our defense. The price of war is always high. It only remains to be seen whether, technically the losers, we are forced to pay a price that prostrates us for many years—as the South was prostrated by the Civil War—or, technically the winners, the conflict exacts a price that we can pay with a more or less decent chance of economic and cultural recovery. With the increasing economic interdependence of the nations, thinner, thinner grows the line between vanquished and victors. Hence, even in the case of a true war-status of defense, there is no escape from disaster.

But shall we not come to the defense of the weak when they are threatened? What about Belgium, for example? The answer is clear, and will be dealt with in a later chapter. Assuming that Belgium was neutral in 1914—it is not excusing Germany to show that she was not—how "defensive" of the weak

was the war method in Belgium as compared, for example, to the non-military protest of Luxembourg? Or with the passive resistance of the Germans in the Ruhr (imperfectly sustained though it was) after the technical ending of the War? Used for a shambles when Napoleon's army was finally driven from her soil, Belgium was forced in just a century to bow once more before a cruel invader, one of her former friends; and since the war, we have seen her, rescued from this latest devastation, signing away her "neutrality" by a military compact with France. How long shall these grim jokes go on?

One serious query remains, however, not to be dismissed lightly. If the aggressor cannot rightly be defined, how then apply non-violent sanctions such as ostracism or the pressure of public opinion? Surely, even for a moral victory, there must be some method of focusing condemnation where it is deserved.

There is. First we have to admit that almost never, excepting for the cases of imperial piracy against small nations, is guilt all on one side; in practically every war-threatening controversy between great powers, the culpability has to be divided, in varying proportions. And next we have to recognize that the best test of an "aggressor"—though not a test that any government of to-day will accept until it is compelled to do so by public opinion and therefore a test that cannot be applied—is simply this: an aggressor nation is a nation which makes any preparation, display or use in peace or war of military weapons. Here is a definition which is at least in accord with the facts of international relations, even if international *realpolitik* will not permit aggression thus to be defined in practice.

No imperialism can long endure without the implements of war; and while they are retained, small nations are not safe. Thanks (?) to the bombing plane, the days of seventy-six are long since past, and probably forever. Freedom from the imperialist yoke cannot be purchased in our times by open or guerrilla warfare. The Aguinaldos and Sandinos of the future can be but advertisers of a cause.

Society must mobilize not against an actual aggressor but a threatening nation, a nation armed and ready for a war; just as it stamps out communicable diseases by defining as dangerous anyone who has the malady and by applying antisepsis. A pacific nation is a disarmed nation, a coöperating nation, a nation creative, constructive, trusting the processes of peace. Any other if tested practically, is an aggressor, a constant menace to the world's well-being.

I advocate no literal non-resistance. None of the non-resistants ever lived it: they resisted, though not by violence. The Quakers did not practice it; nor do the very ones to-day who use the term for want of a better. To justice we owe a debt as well as to peace.

No one to-day would urge a supine acceptance of the invader's terms, irrespective of their appeal to his sense of fair play and his intelligent estimate of their good or harm to the future of humanity. An increasing number, however, would advocate the substitution, for military defense, of active good will accompanied by non-coöperation with wrong or injustice. They would adduce, as partial evidence that such an attitude is practicable, the long history of the Quakers, in Pennsylvania and elsewhere; or, it may be, in recent times the Chinese boycott of Japanese goods which ultimately had much to do with the restoration of Shantung; or the non-coöperation campaigns in South Africa and India under the leadership of M. K. Gandhi.

They would have to admit, however, in deference to truth, that these and similar experiments have not been unmixed with hate and violence on the part of those not yet sufficiently self-disciplined. And the discipline required for successful non-violent resistance, especially an unyielding resistance in the spirit of good will, is infinitely greater than that imposed by stern officers for military morale.[25]

In his *Non-Violent Coercion.* Clarence Marsh Case, after pointing out all the dangers from within that such a method of resistance must face, is still able to say:

It is plain that, if persuasion and non-violent coercion must fall short of realizing the largest hopes of aroused and eager social crusaders, it is still more clearly demonstrated that the methods of *violence* offer infinitely less of permanent good.

If no more than that were true, it would be incalculably worthwhile for a nation, if ever truly a defender, to try non-violence and "applied good will." The nations of the world have heard about loving their enemies and about heaping coals of fire; but they have thus far practiced such tactics against no enemy whatever. To do so would be risky; lives might be lost, property destroyed, and civilization shaken. But with war what it is in this modern era and in a conflict of magnitude, dire loss in terms of property, life, and civilization is not a problematical speculation as an outcome of the military method; it is an absolute certainty.

However untried and unsure is the way of pacifist defense, even so reticent a scholar as Professor Case is compelled to concede that

> In actual operation as described, and also in theory, these methods seem capable of producing effects upon economic and political affairs, without entailing the bitter and irremediable after-effects that spring up in the paths of violence.

Security—From What?

Lured, however, by this baseless idea of defensive war, the nations of the earth through their spokesmen at Geneva and wherever an international assemblage occurs, join frantically in an inept search for a basis of security.

"Men's solicitude for self-defence," rang the words of truth from the lips of Samuel Whelpley in 1818, "adds nothing to their security."

No nation can be assured of security without assurance on the part of every other nation of its own insecurity. A country absolutely secure guarantees the insecurity of every other. Under the war-on-the-aggressor compacts, it is a certainty that war anywhere means war more and more nearly everywhere;

that no nation is secure against war. And security against war is the only security which truly matters.

Real security from war can come only when we have killed the willingness of people in every country to make war, to such an extent that by the presence of dependably recalcitrant minorities, the war-making power of governments is hamstrung.

Paradoxically, but truly none the less, security can be obtained only by the achievement of total military insecurity. History shows that a bully among the nations is in the long run insecure; it shows that whenever nations have built up armaments for security these armaments have had to be used. We may be obliged to learn from another world conflict, waged in the name of law and order, that threats of punitive war constitute just one more guarantee of insecurity.

Without security, statesmen say, there can be no disarmament. Without disarmament, retort the peace forces of the world, there can be no security. This circular argument has rolled like a hoop across the century just passed. It will stop with a bump when statesmen find the peace forces ready to do something more than talk; when they cease to handle the gods of war with deference.

The peace movement has followed such a deferential policy for over a hundred years. The more radical view has not prevailed. Not because of this alone, but because of it in part, it was possible for a War Department *Manual of Citizenship Training* in 1927 to say, with unintentional irony:

> America has never fought a war of aggression. She has always endeavored to maintain peaceful relations with other nations. Yet practically every generation has been compelled to take up arms in defense of the Nation or the principles set forth in her Constitution.[26]

It is not, you can hardly fail to realize, for the Nation quite so frequently as for our principles. And when you analyze that down, it resolves into just what has been previously said—our national interest.

How often we have "been compelled" to take up arms is indicated by the fact that in our national history—exclusive of the Revolution—we have fought five major wars, sixty-seven Indian campaigns, and have carried on an almost continuous fanfare of minor engagements.

The *Historical Register and Dictionary of the United States Army,* published in 1903, contains an interesting chronological list of "battles, actions, etc., in which troops of the regular army have participated." This list extends only from 1790 to the middle of June, 1902, and does not include naval engagements or marine actions at all. Yet it enumerates no fewer than 3292 separate engagements of sufficient importance to justify a record. The records become more interesting still when you discover that if the war years of the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War and the War with Spain are taken out, 2328, or approximately seventy-two per cent of these engagements, are accountable to years of "peace."

A more detailed record is the *Alphabetical List of Battles,* compiled by Newton A. Strait from official records and published as a government document in 1909. This reference book lists nearly nine thousand battles and important skirmishes in the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War and various minor military excursions. Violence and combat seem to have been something of a steady diet, even in this supposedly pacific country.

As a deterrent from conflict, as a means to security from war, the concept of "defensive" war seems to have been more than a little wanting.

CHAPTER VI

TOWARD UNION OF THE WORLD

In Rome, the notion of international obligation was very strongly felt. No war was considered just which had not been officially declared; and even in the case of wars with barbarians, the Roman historians often discuss the sufficiency or insufficiency of the motives, with a conscientious severity a modern historian could hardly surpass. The later Greek and Latin writings occasionally contain maxims which exhibit a considerable progress in this sphere. The sole legitimate object of war, both Cicero and Sallust declared to be an assured Peace.—LECKY, *History of European Morals.*

CHAPTER VI

TOWARD UNION OF THE WORLD

It has been the fashion for writers on world organization, arguing by precedent, to trace the idea of an international confederacy from earliest times.

There is indeed a certain similarity among the old-time plans; but it would be stretching facts out of proportion to assume primarily an unselfish, pacific motive for all such projects.[1]

The Amphictyonic leagues of ancient Greece, named after King Amphictyon, were bound fraternally in an economic, religious and political alliance, the one best known, centering in Delphi, comprising a union of twelve states. But behind each fraternal family lay a menace from the others—economic and military; and each confederacy existed as much for the safeguarding of its own power as for the beneficent motives often ascribed to the amphictyonies by their press agents in the peace movement. Even among themselves the member states were not held back from wars, and they sometimes made war on other groups to carry out their purposes.

Essentially the same is true of the Lycian League of twenty-three cities in ancient Asia Minor prior to the sixth century B.C., and the Achæan League of the Grecian peninsula in the second and third centuries B.C.

Dante, and Marsilius of Padua, in fourteenth-century Italy, and the Abbé Honoré Bonnor in France of the same century, promulgated the idea of a federation of states under the rule of a single monarch; but these were to be as much concerned with military strength and safety as with peace in the real sense of the term.

Podiebrad, King of Bohemia, sought to establish a pacific European empire in the fifteenth century; but its function, as he saw it, was to draw the teeth of the threatening Turkish tiger, ever ready to forage from the eastward jungles on the territories of the righteous.

At the end of the fifteenth century a scheme was agitated for a congress of kings at Cambrai, by William of Ciervia (in all probability an Italian town) and John Sylvagius, Chancellor of Burgundy—the latter influencing Erasmus to write *The Complaint of Peace.*

Erasmus in 1516 proposed a kingdom of all Europe. The ambitious Cardinal Wolsey for a time maneuvered to the same ostensible end in order that his liege, King Henry VIII, might head the federation; while others coveted that honor for the Pope. Few indeed were the plans for anything in those days—days not unique in that respect—conjecturable apart from political intrigue.

A French savant, Émeric Crucé, published in 1623 a project for a congress of ambassadors to represent every nation of the world, to meet continuously. This plan would probably have split, if attempted, on the rock of precedence, which he assigned in the following order: the Pope, the Sultan, the Emperor, the King of France, the King of Spain, etc.

The Grand Design of the Duke of Sully and France's King Henry IV, launched about 1600, is one of the most famous plans for a republic of European states, embracing France, Great Britain, Sweden, Spain, Lombardy, Denmark, the Papal See, the Holy Roman Empire, Bohemia, Hungary, Poland, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Venice and Central Italy. Religious liberty and free trade, along with arbitration through a joint judicial body, were major planks in Henry's platform. The French dreamer might have made headway with the project, for Queen Elizabeth was greatly interested in it; but his career was peremptorily cut short by the blade of the assassin, Ravaillac. Henry's grandiose Christian league, however, like that of Podiebrad, contemplated the subjugation of the Turk by force of combined military power.

The great work done for international law by Hugo Grotius in his *De Jure Belli ac Pacis* was supplemented by proposals for arbitration courts and congresses; but Grotius' mind was primarily obsessed with the hope of regulating and humanizing war.

A "society of sovereigns" was suggested in 1666 by a German prince, Ernest Landgrave of Hesse-Rheinfels (or Hessen-Rheinfels or Hesse-Cassel), and von Pufendorf in 1672 followed with a similar proposal in his *Law of Nature and of Nations*. Again this scheme was hardly of unalloyed pacific implications.

Even William Penn, after demonstrating by his "holy experiment" in Pennsylvania that the impossible can be done, brought out at the end of the seventeenth century his *Essay Towards the Present and Future Peace of Europe By the Establishment of an European Diet, Parliament, or Estates,*[2] and provided therein for the sanctions of force:

> . . . before which sovereign assembly should be brought all differences depending between one sovereign and another that cannot be made up by private embassies before the sessions begin; and that if any of the sovereignties that constitute these imperial states shall refuse to submit their claim or pretensions to them or to abide and perform the judgment thereof, and seek their remedy by arms, or delay their compliance beyond the time prefixed in their resolutions, all the other sovereignties, united as one strength, shall compel the submission and performance of the sentence, with damages to the suffering party, and charges to the sovereignties that obliged their submission.

A few years later, in 1713, the Abbé Charles Irénée Castel de Saint-Pierre, stirred by the War of the Spanish Succession, published in Utrecht where he was secretary to one of the French plenipotentiaries at the peace settlement his *Projet de la Paix Perpetuelle*. Saint-Pierre's scheme was set forth in great detail, centering in a Senate of Europe, made up of twenty-four delegates representing the adhering nations. It wielded a great influence on political thought; Rousseau was greatly moved by it and borrowed many of its ideas for his own works. But Saint-Pierre was concerned not merely with the preserva-

tion of peace within the federation, but with its power, if necessarily exerted, against outside states or combinations.

Though less a scheme for organized peace than a set of principles by which mankind might outgrow war, the peace essay by Immanuel Kant published in 1795 was far more radical in many respects than anything of a similar character ever issued in the past. At an inn Kant had seen one time a sign depicting a cemetery, and over it the words *Zum ewigen Frieden,* "To Eternal Peace." In Kantian irony, the philosopher seized on this title for his essay. It was a highly idealistic work, envisaging a state of peace toward which the human race would be driven inevitably by the logic of progress from the natural to the directive condition of society. Though clinging still to "sovereignty"—or what he called *majestät*—Kant declared that peace must be based on three principles: first, every nation to be republican (though not necessarily a republic) with a body of responsive representatives of the people; second, a federation of free states—later, in 1796, defined as a "continuous congress of nations"; third, the rights of any nation in any other to be limited to the rights of hospitality.

Though not published until 1839, a Plan for a Universal and Perpetual Peace was written by Jeremy Bentham, the proponent of utilitarianism, between 1786 and 1789. Bentham's project embraced a diplomatic conference or diet, with two deputies from each member state, to act as a tribunal for the settlement of all disputes. All decisions were to be enforced by public opinion, or, that failing, by political and economic ostracism of the offending country. All colonies were to be freed, and armaments were to be drastically reduced by common agreement.

Kant's outspoken, daring essay and the non-military project of Bentham make a natural transition from their war-tinctured predecessors to the Congress of Nations and High Court proposed in the United States by the pioneers of the peace movement. There was in these no war sugar-coated as "enforcement of peace," "restraining the aggressor," or "war for law."

The sanctions were the strength of publicity, public reproach, international ostracism; in short, that public opinion which, said William Ladd, no army, no fortress, can withstand, which "reaches the tyrant on the throne, and the conqueror on the field of battle, and stings through the folds of purple and the coat of mail."

It is only in these latter days, under the influence of leaders who dare not take both feet at once out of the bogs of the war system, that the peace movement has been swinging back to the sanction of military force, to the war to end war, to that curious fire protection which seeks to put out a conflagration by drenching it in gasoline.

The "American Plan" of 1828-40

A man of such stature as William Ladd needs no excessive adulation; but he has received it, naturally enough, from the Society that he founded, and sometimes to the confusion of the facts. It gives no adequate comprehension of historic development to say, as the American Peace Society has said repeatedly, "The founder of the Society, William Ladd, was the first to propose a Congress and High Court of Nations." Having outlined in his own project some of the schemes referred to above, he would hardly make such an unqualified claim. Even so, however, Ladd himself reveals in his writing an extraordinary unfamiliarity with the literature of the peace movement prior to his personal entry into the struggle.

In 1840, after the breakdown of a prize contest for essays on a Congress of Nations—a subject dear to the heart of Ladd and his cohorts since 1828—the splendid persistence of the intellectual ex-sea-dog rescued the best of the essays from loss. Ladd secured enough subscribers to warrant their publication in a large volume, *Prize Essays on a Congress of Nations.* Five essays by contestants are included, one of them under the authorship of Thomas C. Upham. The sixth and last essay was the work of Ladd, and was the second longest in the collection—a fact which hardly warranted him in chiding the

others for prolixity! He states that out of the thirty-five essays not published, he has selected and adapted the best thoughts, adding to them his own ideas.

The author has endeavored to comprise all the thoughts on a Congress of Nations contained in the rejected essays, worth preserving. He differs from all the other essays, either accepted or rejected, in dividing the subject into *two parts,* viz., a *Congress* of Nations, for the purpose of settling the principles of international law; and a Court of Nations, for the adjudication of cases submitted to it by the mutual consent of two or more contending nations.

Undeniably true; but the student of to-day is at a loss to explain the following statement of Ladd's about the Massachusetts Peace Society:

There is nothing in the publications of the Massachusetts Peace Society which favors the idea that the plan for a Congress of Nations ever engaged the attention of the Rev. Noah Worcester, D.D., the venerable founder of that institution and the only editor of "Friend of Peace," the organ of that society, or of any one of its members; nor do we find any mention of the plan in the publications or proceedings of any other peace society in America prior to the organization of the American Peace Society.

From the context it is clear that Ladd referred, not to his own specific plan, but to the general concept whose evolution he had been tracing. Yet in Noah Worcester's *Solemn Review*—the very pamphlet responsible, along with the influence of President Appleton who also had been moved by it, for Ladd's conversion to the peace movement—the stocky crusader of Boston had said:

If the eyes of people could be opened in regard to the evils and delusions of war, would it not be easy to form a confederacy of nations, and organize a high court of equity, to decide national controversies? Why might not such a court be composed of some of the most eminent characters from each nation; and a compliance with the decision of the court be made a point of national honor to prevent the effusion of blood and to preserve the blessings of peace?

He had written in *The Friend of Peace* for August, 1819—

nine years before the American Peace Society was formed—a three-page article about the value to humanity of a High International Tribunal, with public opinion to enforce its decisions, citing as the example of such a court the Supreme Court of the United States, still one of the most common arguments used to-day by proponents of the outlawry of war.

In April, 1820, Worcester reprinted from a British peace periodical a "poem" written in 1813:

A Remedy for War

What could secure the earth from future wars
So fully as a mutual compact made,
THE BASIS OF THE PEACE, that future wrongs
Of realm and realm should finally be judged
As those between the subjects of one king?

And in *The Friend of Peace* for July, 1820, he spoke in no uncertain terms to the very point Ladd says he never mentioned. Witness:

. . . we may suggest some means for improving the condition of men, relieving them from unnecessary burdens, preserving peace between different nations, and tranquillity under the several governments. We shall, however, attempt only an outline of a plan of improvement, in a few propositions:—

1. That the several powers of Christendom should agree on a General Congress to be held at the most convenient place, composed of authorized delegates from every government which may be disposed to unite in the general object.

2. That the real and avowed object of the Congress be, to devise and adopt means for improving the condition, preserving the peace, and promoting the general welfare of all nations.

In particular:—

To organize a High Tribunal for the adjustment of disputes between the several powers, and thus to prevent the crimes and miseries of war.

To agree on reciprocal terms for the reduction of standing armies and navies, that the burdens of the people in each country may be diminished, and that national revenues may be applied to more useful and benevolent purposes than the destruction of mankind.

To form a solemn compact, that in future no armed force by

sea or land shall be employed by any one nation for the annoyance of another—nor for any purpose, except the legal suppression of piracy, the slave trade, insurrection, and outrage. . . . Something analogous to the plan now proposed has been suggested by writers of great respectability.

The plan for a Congress of Nations and a World Court had been "in the air" for centuries. Through the suggestions of Worcester, Upham, and others, and the tremendous driving energy of William Ladd, it was laid before the American people persuasively, in detail, with an erudition born of the keen minds whose scattering shot of argument Ladd had fused into a rifle bullet of conviction.

As early as 1830, an enthusiast whose labors are shrouded with anonymity, went about among the citizens of Boston purposely neglecting the peace societies and the "aristocracy," and secured many signatures (unfortunately no exact number is reported) to the following declaration:

We, the undersigned, convinced of the great advantages and blessings which *an abolition of war,* and the reference of all international disputes to a *Court of Nations,* would confer on mankind, heartily concur in recommending a suitable reference of this subject, by the peace societies, to the attention of Congress, as soon as such a reference shall be found practicable and convenient.[3]

Nine out of ten, when offered this document, so says the sponsor of it, signed without hesitation, and even the minority of non-signers praised its main idea.

Encouraged by this symptom of public hospitality, no doubt, the warriors on war let no grass grow under their feet. They went out to capture support in high places. Chief Justice John Marshall's response was rather typical. To Ladd he wrote, September 12, 1832, from Richmond:

The human race would be eminently benefitted by the principle you advance. The religious man and the philanthropist must equally pray for its establishment. Yet I must avow my belief that it is impracticable.[4]

But faith burned strong in the sturdy souls of Ladd and his

fellow pacifists. By February, 1835, they had indeed made headway. William Ladd and Thomas Thompson, Jr., had addressed a petition with several thousand signatures to the Massachusetts Legislature, had induced the Honorable Sidney Willard to present it to the Senate, and on the sixth of that month experienced the pleasure of knowing that for the first time in our history an official body was considering a definite plea for international peace—though a plea not as yet crystallized into any specific scheme. A special committee of three soon rendered a favorable report, which was adopted by a vote of nineteen to five; the only appreciable opposition coming from a "gentleman who, needlessly," as Ladd remarked, "acknowledged that he had never examined the subject."

Two years passed by; years occupied by a multitude of arduous duties, not the least of which was the preparation of further petitions. A pair of strong appeals were made in 1837 to the Legislature of Massachusetts, which were referred to a joint committee; and to the elation of the peace societies, the committee's report was highly favorable, specifically inviting the attention of the President to the subject and recommending "a negotiation with such other governments, as in its wisdom it may deem proper, with a view to effect so important an arrangement"—the arrangement being nothing less than an International Congress! By a vote of thirty-five to five in the State Senate and a unanimous vote in the House, this historic report was adopted.

The petitioners fared less well in Maine and Vermont; but even there, as in most of the states where peace societies had taken hold, many individuals and religious bodies were manifesting an active interest. The time had come for a more ambitious drive; and the campaign was shifted from the banks of the Charles to the more difficult shores of the Potomac.

This time the New York Peace Society got away to a quick start, with a half-dozen petitions signed by 609 more or less influential citizens of the then respectable Manhattan Isle. The other peace societies fell in line: 540 petitioners in Maine, 144 in Vermont, even 136 members of the Massachusetts Legisla-

ture, totaling altogether nearly 1500 signatures. Not a great number, indeed; but as Ladd reports, "more attention was paid to the respectability than to the number of subscribers."

Congress, however, refused to be impressed though the petitions were heralded by the liquid speech of John Quincy Adams in the House. As Adams wrote to Ladd, "The Chairman of the Committee of Foreign Affairs manifested a strong inclination to have it laid on the table." These petitions had made the unfortunate tactical error of being concrete instead of general; in short, they actually meant something, suggesting Mexico as a natural country with whom to start the process of amicable settlement by arbitration; and such a step as that was quite too much for the constitutions of many good brethren on Capitol Hill, who saw lurking behind the proposals the looming demon of abolitionist sentiment against the expansion of slave territory.

This experience, reënforced by an illuminating journey of Ladd's to Washington, convinced the man from Maine, as the peace movement has always been convinced every few years only to forget it again, that "if the rulers in representative governments are to be induced to adopt any new measure of public utility, it must be through their constituents. In such purposes application must be made chiefly to those in whom the sovereignty is established—to monarchs in monarchical governments, to the people in popular governments, and to both in mixed governments. . . . Before either the President or the Congress of these United States will act on this subject, the sovereign people must act, and before they will act, they must be acted upon by the 'friends of peace.' "

For a span of eighty-eight years the "friends of peace" have been "acting on" the people, usually, however, neglecting the masses and concentrating on the well-known worthies, and periodically descending on a well-nigh impregnable Washington.

On January 16, 1849, the Honorable Amos Tuck introduced into Congress a resolution for the institution of arbitration treaties and the establishment of a Congress of Nations. The

American Peace Society was still pushing for this program after the Civil War, and after the Spanish-American War was calling for a World Parliament. Arbitration especially, but also a World Court and Congress of Nations were supported by the more radical Universal Peace Union from its organization in 1866 to its disappearance, for all practical purposes, with the death of its founder and pulmotor, Alfred H. Love, in 1913. In fact, the project has won its way to an increasing status in the public opinion of the United States, despite our non-adherence to the present League. In view of what happened between 1914 and 1918, chronic isolationists may look back on our history and derive what joy they can from William Ladd's despairing and rather savage cry in August, 1840:

> The glory of this movement I would fain have my own beloved country receive; but I should not be surprised if the King of Prussia should send in his adhesion to the plan before we can get our own rulers to move in its behalf.

The Outline of Ladd's League and Court

Ladd's *Essay on a Congress of Nations, for the Adjustment of International Disputes, and for the Promotion of Universal Peace, without Resort to Arms*—those last four words are worthy of especial notice—was circulated by the author among the crowned and uncrowned leaders of national life all over the world. Like Worcester's *Solemn Review* its influence was out of all proportion to the numerical magnitude of the movement from which it grew.

The zest with which United States citizens have been prone to generalize from their own institutions must seem to other nations rather naïve. But we thus generalize to-day, and Ladd was doing so in 1840. Here is the threefold U.S. pattern:

> I consider the Congress as the legislature, and the Court as the judiciary, in the government of nations, leaving the functions of the executive with public opinion, "the queen of the world."

I trust I have not succumbed to the appeal of one-hundred-percent Americanism when I state, however, my belief that Ladd

may not have been as groundlessly overconfident as appears at first sight when he declared,

> This division I have never seen in any essay or plan for a congress or diet of independent nations, either ancient or modern; and I believe it will obviate all the objections which have been heretofore made to such a plan.

The Congress, according to Ladd, would create and codify international law, thus laying a basis of order and procedure; the Court would adjust international differences, thus interpreting and applying the law. In his conception of the organization of the Congress and its method of operation, he went further than most proponents of international federation go to-day; but in his conception of the Court he was just about as advanced as the most conservative Court advocates now are, providing for the consideration of disputes submitted only by both parties. In the present Permanent Court of International Justice forty-three nations have already agreed to the principle of compulsory jurisdiction by signing, though in most cases with reservations, the so-called optional clause; of these signers twenty-nine have ratified (August, 1930). Unlike the present Permanent Court (I am not referring here to the earlier Hague Tribunal of Arbitration) which provides for both summary and advisory opinions, Ladd's court stopped with the latter. In his ideas of the kinds of cases to be handled by such a court, as also of the questions of law with which the Congress should concern itself, Ladd was still too close to the war system and the "regulation" basis of Grotius, Vattel, and the elder von Martens—whose works on international relations engrossed the attention of most early scholars in the American peace movement.

It is the importance ascribed by William Ladd's composite program to the police power of public opinion which gives it distinction. Said he:

> . . . if we look into the condition of man in a state of civilization, it will be found that where one man obeys the laws for fear of the sword of the magistrate, an hundred obey through fear of public opinion.

We who are for the present League of Nations, when hard pressed by its critics in respect to the sanctions of Article XVI, customarily point out a gradual reduction in the use of force and an increasing emphasis by the League on public opinion. Such arguments are on the whole but specious. Too little time, by far, has yet elapsed for anyone to say with sound support in fact, that the sanctions of armed force have fallen into a blessed coma of innocuous desuetude; else why all the talk in recent years of an overwhelming force to be hurled against an offending and dangerous "outlaw" member? The authorization is there, ready for instant reference when the frantic crisis comes. And it is on that Gibraltar of might, bristling with guns, however veiled by the mists of diplomatic verbiage or caverned in diplomatic silence, that the ship of peace, builded by patient and hopeful hands, will smash next time the international seas are lashed to fury.

All men not utterly blind to the consequences of the League's failure must hope for its success; but what realistic observer can doubt the gravity of its inability to disarm, or the extent to which it is interwoven with imperialism, or its sanction in the last analysis of military might? If it is unable to purge itself of these basic dangers, it may appear to our descendants not as an instrument of peace at all, but an agency of militarism, of oppression, of deadly conflict—a larger but no less execrable Holy Alliance.

In fact, there is an ironic lesson in the circumstance that for a time the exertions of the early peace movement everywhere were diverted from the ultimate formation of a real peace Congress, to labors of hope on behalf of the now unsavory "Holy League."

The Holy League of Long Ago

When Napoleon Bonaparte had flung his troops in one final unavailing effort against the Allies, and militarism was crushed in Europe (so said the optimists) the Emperor of Russia, Alexander I, made a visit to London. While there he attended a religious service of the Society of Friends which greatly im-

pressed him. Shortly afterwards, he was interviewed by William Allen and Stephen Grellet, another famous Friend of saintly, strenuous life. He carried Friends' books to Russia with him when he left, after assuring Grellet and Allen that "these are my sentiments also." Afterward, the two Quakers made a venturous trip to St. Petersburg, where, with Daniel Wheeler, a Friend authorized by Alexander to undertake a huge drainage project, they besought his influence for world peace.

Meantime, from the United States, Noah Worcester's *Solemn Review* was on its tortuous way to the pious monarch's desk. To the Massachusetts Peace Society, Alexander's Prime Minister, Prince Galitzin, expressed the Emperor's sincere interest and agreement, by a letter courteously written in English.

Who can weigh the effect of seemingly futile gestures? How important a factor these influences were in Alexander's dreams of a peaceful Europe no one can positively say. Though the Tsar had exhibited interest in international coöperation as early as 1804, the evidence is ample, in my opinion, to warrant the conclusion of the peace movement in this country and the Friends in England, often expressed, that these bold efforts at persuasion were responsible in no small measure for his newer actions. Certainly another element was the Emperor's conversion by that strange mystical fanatic, the Baroness von Krüdener.

Suffice it to say that the Congress of Vienna, ending in June, 1815, "a war settlement" as much in terms of the future as of the past, was followed in November by the formation of the Holy Alliance of Austria, Prussia, and Russia. No combination of states before or since was ever announced by so exalted an Act of Alliance, containing that memorable passage:

> The sole principle of force, whether between Governments or between their subjects, shall be that of doing each other reciprocal service, and of testifying by unalterable good will the mutual affection with which they ought to be animated, to consider themselves all as members of one and the same Christian nation; the three allied Princes, looking upon themselves as merely delegated

by Providence to govern three branches of the one family, namely Austria, Russia, and Prussia, thus confessing that the Christian world of which they and their people form a part, has in reality no other Sovereign than Him to whom alone power really belongs, because in Him alone are found all the treasures of love, science, and infinite wisdom, that is to say, God, our divine Saviour, the Word of the Most High, the Word of Life. Their Majesties consequently recommend to their people, with the most tender solicitude, as the sole means of enjoying that Peace which arises from a good conscience and which alone is durable, to strengthen themselves every day more and more in the principles and the exercise of the duties which the divine Saviour has taught to mankind.

What a pity that the zealous Baroness could not also have converted the wily Austrian conspirator, Metternich, who called the Alliance a "loud-sounding nothing!" Under his "master mind" it soon gave a most sinister application to the Treaty of Chaumont, which formed the real basis of this Holy League and which had not overlooked the object

. . . of assuring the repose of Europe by the reestablishment of a just equilibrium . . . and of maintaining against all attacks the order of things that shall be the happy outcome of their efforts.

In short, the Alliance became the guardian of the *status quo,* forbidding change for the better as well as change for the worse, denying the rights of the smaller nations to genuine expression, and invading ruthlessly wherever liberal, democratic, or revolutionary ideas threatened to jeopardize the rigidly fixed system by which the "fixers" were to profit and to maintain power and prestige.

But in the calmer air of Massachusetts the paper bearing the Tsar's fine phrases and the League's sublime ambitions crackled with electrifying hope. Said the fifth issue of Noah Worcester's *Friend of Peace:*

Another signal event of this auspicious era, adapted to arouse attention, and to stimulate activity, is the unexampled compact lately formed between three of the greatest monarchs of Europe, the Russian, Austrian, and Prussian; a compact, which they solemnly swear has no other object than "to show, in the face of the

universe, their unwavering determination to adopt, for the only rule of their conduct, both in the administration of their respective states, and in their political relations with every other government, the precepts of the Christian religion, the precepts of justice, of charity and of peace; which, far from being applicable solely to private life, ought, on the contrary, to influence the resolutions of princes, and to guide all their undertakings, as being the best means of giving stability to human institutions, and of remedying their imperfections." Meanwhile they invite "all powers who shall wish to profess the sacred principles," which dictated the measure, "and to acknowledge how important it is to the happiness of nations, too long disturbed, that these truths should henceforth exercise upon human destinies all the influence which belongs to them," to join in "this holy alliance." Thus, in the face of the universe, have these three mighty potentates erected the standard of peace, and invited all nations and all people to rally round it, and combine their influence for the permanent tranquillity and happiness of the world. Only let the principles here solemnly proclaimed be universally adopted, and carried into effect; and wars will cease unto the ends of the earth, the spear will be cut in sunder, and the chariot will be burned in the fire.

The argument for the League proceeded as the great hope grew. In the following number of Worcester's paper we read:

Since the fifth number of this work was published, it has been stated in the newspapers that Sweden, Holland, Denmark, and Switzerland have acceded to the "Holy League," which was formed between Russia, Austria, and Prussia. If this intelligence be correct, SEVEN European governments are now allied for the preservation of peace. May we not hope, that our government will not be the last to accede to the pacific alliance?

Was there a hint of penetrating doubt in the same magazine, next issue?

Let those who formed the "Holy League" but adhere to its principles, and all the nations of Europe will abandon the savage custom.

There was no doubt, however, in the mind of the Honorable Thomas Dawes, one of the Massachusetts Peace Society's most widely known leaders, when he stated to the Society on the occasion of its second anniversary, 1818:

The Holy League of august sovereigns, in which the Emperor of all the Russias has taken so conspicuous a part, is a strong indication of the future prevalence of the cause of Peace. Jealous politicians may have doubted the motive. Oh, familiar words! But they had not then read the undisguised answer of that illustrious man to the Corresponding Secretary of this society.

Inclined to overemphasize the influence of single personalities in the destiny of nations, and therefore to overemphasize the mental state of a ruler who could not, without renouncing his kingdom, step out of the war system in which he was enmeshed no less than those of more evil intent, the "friends of peace" in the United States were hard to convince of lurking wrong. Said Worcester again, early in 1819:

Little reason, it is believed, has been given by their public acts to support the suspicions which were entertained of intrigue and insincerity. But since that period, many have been the acts of Emperor Alexander, which afford reason to believe that he was sincere in professing a desire to prevent the recurrence of war. It has been repeatedly stated in our public papers as a fact, that since the year 1814, he has discharged from the Russian service no less than four hundred and fourteen thousand men; and in his Ukase for establishing the Society of Christian Israelites, he has expressly exempted the whole society from "military services" and from liability to have soldiers quartered upon them.

And shortly after:

When this society was formed, with what a gloom it was surrounded! except when it looked up to the Father of lights, or into the Gospel of his son. . . . Not a syllable had reached our country respecting the pacific league of the three sovereigns; and nothing, perhaps, was more remote from expectation than such a phenomenon. It was, indeed, a formidable objection in the minds of many that nothing of the kind was known to exist in Europe. But now this objection is obviated; the gloom which accompanied the dawn is dispelled, and the SUN OF PEACE is above the horizon.

A little time and the passage of certain concrete events; and then the chill of doubt had struck more deeply.

Admitting the possibility, and even the probability, that the alliance for the preservation of peace will be violated, and that

there will again be wars in Europe, prior to the happy day when the nations shall learn war no more—still the Holy League may be of vast advantage.

And what was that advantage? Do not these words ring with a striking familiarity on the ear of those who hark to uncritical enthusiasts for our present League?

It is calculated to call the attention of the people, of all classes, to the destructive character of war. It opens a door for a free discussion of its nature and principles. . . .

Nevertheless, the inexorable outgrowths of policies that the "pacific" alliance would not relinquish, were such as to justify Sebastiani, Minister of Foreign Affairs in a somewhat chastened France, when in 1830 he declared that

the Holy Alliance has made its own the principle of intervention which annihilates the independence of small nations.

And even seven years before that, on November 7, 1823, President Monroe in the presence of John Quincy Adams, his Secretary of State; John C. Calhoun, his Secretary of War; and Samuel L. Southard, his Secretary of the Navy (his other two cabinet members were absent), laid in these words the corner stone of his historic doctrine:

We learn now with great concern that the Holy Alliance is planning to send armies to America to aid Spain and Portugal. This reactionary body, formed to restore the despotic system which existed in Europe, prior to the French Revolution, has undertaken to stamp out liberty in Europe. . . . The Holy Alliance denies the sovereignty of the people, abhors representative government, and has declared war on the freedom of the press. In short, gentlemen, it is the enemy of all that we hold sacred.[5]

It was soon the enemy of all that the peace societies held sacred. By 1832 the Massachusetts Peace Society, in its annual report, was complaining:

That we do not report the rise of more Peace Societies on the Continent of Europe is because the despotic character and jealous political policy of their governments do not permit them to be openly established with safety.

The fruit had rotted on the tree! But at last the peace movement could work, once more, for a congress of nations after its own heart: a league conception which was indeed a weak and ill-fed infant, yet able to grow with the passing years, free from the leprous taint of military imperialism in its veins. To grow thus free, that is, until, through a nostrum, the poison of war was sent into its blood stream under the dubious offices of an organization known by the world's record-breaking homeopathic title: the League to Enforce Peace. Long before it, Thomas Hobbes had said: "Covenants without the sword are but words." That, exactly, was the L.E.P. idea.

Give them credit. Few organizations have ever won in such brief time so many dignitaries to a banner. Possibly that was one of the things the matter with it. Ex-President William Howard Taft became its president when it was organized on June 17, 1915; and under the energetic support of such men as Theodore Marburg, Hamilton Holt, and others it flourished. Its essential idea was endorsed by Aristide Briand, von Bethmann-Hollweg, Viscount Grey, and President Wilson, whose famous speech before the League's membership in May, 1916, betrays what inroads the "force without stint or limit" of a later day had made even then upon his mind, under, of course, a supposititious service to world order. "Mere agreements," said Mr. Wilson, "may not make peace secure. It will be absolutely necessary that a force be created as a guarantor of the permanency of the settlement so much greater than the force of any nation now engaged or any alliance hitherto formed or projected, that no nation, no possible combination of nations, could face or withstand it."

During the World War the peace movement, under whose auspices we were rushed into the conflict, stated often that the Allies were in effect organized as that very force; that the War in actuality was simply a campaign to safeguard peace against a marauder. Casting one eye over the utterly discredited idea of Germany's sole guilt, and the other at the kind of struggle another such campaign would surely be, a skeptical observer may be excused for reminding himself of the candidate for a

civil service position who was asked what to do to stop a nosebleed, and who answered, "Put a tourniquet around the neck."

But it is just this sort of "martial logic" that inspired the Covenant's Articles X and XVI. It underlay the proposed Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance; the proposed Geneva Protocol; it underlies the Locarno treaties; it was not really forbidden by the Pact of Paris (soon to be considered); it is implicit if not explicit in substantially every project launched by the orthodox peace movement since the League to Enforce Peace took the peace forces on its back and mounted up with wings (and claws and beak) as of eagles.

The core of the question is to be found in Article X; and the best illustration of how pivotal is the idea of military force in the League of Nations is in the numerous attempts, long drawn out and uniformly fruitless, to arrive at a common understanding of this Article.[6] From the time when Canada requested its elimination soon after the League was organized, committee after committee, composed of eminent jurists, have tried to find out what responsibility for the use of armed force rests upon member states of the League who have declared under Article X, that

> The Members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all Members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

It should be noted that the Council, under the Covenant, does not decide whether or not a violation of the Covenant has occurred. Rather, it merely expresses an opinion and the member states do not have to concur; but as a practical procedure a sharp disagreement with a group of such powerful nations as those on the Council would be none too likely.

Also, as declared by the Commission of Jurists on Article X in September, 1921:

> The members are not obliged to take part in any military action. It is true that Article XVI alludes to joint military action to be

organized, on the recommendation of the Council, by the several Governments concerned; but, in general, the members are not legally bound to take part in such action. . . . The Committee wishes to point out that there can be no doubt that the Council, under the terms of this Article, can only advise as to the means to be employed; it cannot impose them.

This interpretative trend had its latest official showdown in the Fourth Assembly, when a resolution on Article X definitely declared that the measure in which each member was bound to use military forces was a matter for the authorities of that state to determine, though "the recommendation made by the Council shall be regarded as being of the highest importance and shall be taken into consideration by all the members of the League with the desire to execute their engagements in good faith." Twenty-nine nations, including England, France, and Italy, voted for this resolution; Persia was the only country to vote against it. But twenty-two nations did not vote at all, and the resolution was accordingly declared neither adopted nor rejected! This may be taken as evidence, however, that the non-sanction school within the League is powerful and that happily it by no means has abandoned its campaign to persuade the countries still wedded to the notion of "enforcing" peace.

The plain truth is that nobody knows—nobody in the world—what the legal obligations are and are not, for the use of force when ordered by the Council. As for that, the question doesn't seriously matter; for the Council possesses within itself—excepting Soviet Russia and the United States—about all the real military and economic power there is to use.

Under the influence of the Pact of Paris and the liberalization of British policy under the Labor Ministry, the danger in the situation has been most hopefully modified through the signature of the new powers to the Optional Clause of the World Court, whereby they submit to "affirmative" or, substantially, compulsory jurisdiction. Hitherto only small nations, except Germany, had signed; but at the League Assembly of 1929 this forward step was taken by most of the great nations within the League.

There is incalculably dangerous international anarchy in an irresponsible aloofness on the part of the United States; on the other hand, the continued existence of international anarchy within the League must not be underestimated, even though it is definitely decreasing. And even though we have not joined, the influence of the Kellogg Treaty has been great on League policy and has symbolized a growing rapprochement between the League process and the viewpoint of this country.

An exhaustive bulletin of the Foreign Policy Association [7] excellently summarizes the kinds of wars which are allowed to League members by the Covenant:

1. Wars to enforce judicial decisions, arbitral awards or recommendations of the Council.
2. Private or duel wars, e.g., wars which may arise when the Council fails to reach a unanimous agreement.
3. Punitive wars directed against a state which is guilty of a breach of the Covenant.

Illumination on the moot question of military sanctions in the Council of the League was shed by an exchange of correspondence late in 1927 between the British Prime Minister, Mr. Baldwin, and the present Lord Ponsonby, who had sent the government a Peace Letter signed by 128,770 persons declaring in advance their refusal to take part in another war. Said Mr. Baldwin:

Article 16 of the Covenant lays upon the Council the duty to "recommend to the several Governments concerned what effective military, naval and air force the members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the covenants of the League." How can we honour this undertaking without armed forces? Clearly we could not do so. We should be obliged to leave the League. . . . The complaint which has been heard in the Assembly of the League is not that the armaments of Great Britain are excessive or that they menace the peace of the world. It is that these forces are not placed more unreservedly at the disposal of the League for the enforcement of its decrees.

M. Briand, in his first negotiations with Secretary of State Kellogg in late 1927 for a Franco-American treaty outlawing war, declared that France could not sign a treaty barring war

altogether because of her commitments to the League's force sanctions. Thus a great League power felt it could not consummate a treaty prohibiting war, though able to sign military treaties freely—as, for example, the treaties between France and Belgium, or Poland and Roumania (with France as a third party).

If force is not an essential in the League, why need any League nations persecute their war resisters? In some of the countries belonging to the League, even in times of peace those who refuse military drill and army service for conscientious reasons are often treated with ruthless severity worse, if anything, than that accorded common criminals.

One hundred and eleven resolutions on armaments, Professor William I. Hull pointed out, in 1928, were "adopted by the Assembly and Council of the League of Nations in forty-four of their sessions; fourteen of the League's Commissions have debated disarmament in 120 sessions." The hope of the future is the establishment of pacific bases for the international structure that will not only stand pressure but will tend to push the League steadily away from reliance on force.

War and peace cannot live in the same house and abide with safety. The lamb may lie down with the lion under such an arrangement; but in the cold gray dawn of the morning after it seldom if ever gets up again.

In the long run, the most important test of the League as a force for peace and as an aid to justice—for the two cannot be separated—will be this: can it provide the machinery, if its present machinery proves too rigid, and can it summon a sufficiently generous mood on the part of the great powers, to make possible without resort to arms, the necessary changes in the *status quo?* No major test of this kind has yet confronted the League. Soon or late the terrifying test will come.

On the eve of the World War, a profound student of international relations and a believer in peace—albeit a conservative—described the nature of that test in words scarcely less true in this day of an organized League than in the pre-War period of international anarchy:

If we study the map of the world, it is impossible not to be struck with the fact that national boundaries, even in Europe, are still in the highest degree "artificial." The function of a new international confederation would again be, like that of the Holy Alliance, to protect these artificial boundaries; to attempt, that is to say, to stereotype political systems with which, certainly in many cases, the people who live under them are not content. The attempt would be even less likely to succeed now, when the spirit of nationalism is strong, than a hundred years ago when it was in its weak beginnings. . . .

The new Holy Alliance, then, like the old, would find itself face to face with revolutionary forces which it would have to repress, save in the very probable event of its being willing to conciliate them by conceding their extreme demands: the satisfaction of every nationalist aspiration, and the universal establishment of pure democracy under unimpeachable republican forms. In any case conflicting ideals would, sooner or later, struggle within it for mastery, and in the end it would not bring peace but a sword.[8]

As against this disturbing prophecy, stand the Irish Free State, autonomous Iceland, Soviet Russia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, the conglomerate Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes. Yet with the exception of the first two examples of "self-determination," these arbitrary and often reasonless dispensations of territorial control contain as many seeds of future conflict as did the pre-War explosives by which they were propelled into their present precarious existence. As an illustration of the turbulent minority problems which threaten Europe's future peace, the observer's attention is invited to the accompanying map.

Against the pre-War international anarchy consider the critical conflict of capitalist and communist ideology as exemplified in Mussolini or France contrasted to the Soviet Union; against the defiance of decency in the pre-War secret agreements, the present flouting of League ideals and procedure by its own members, openly and by secret compacts; against Imperial Russia and Imperial Germany, the post-War dictatorships of varying ruthlessness in Italy, Russia, Greece, Persia, Spain, Lithuania, Turkey, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Roumania, Jugoslavia, and heaven hardly knows where not.

From a confidential report which recently came to hand from a group of travelers and observers, men of balanced judgment and acquainted with many sorts of people from labor and



Used by permission of The Literary Digest, New York.

EUROPE'S NATIONAL MINORITIES

religious groups to political leaders, one can derive nourishment only for well-grounded concern. Of the region throughout North Central Europe and around the Baltic they say:

Amongst all the minorities with which we came into contact, the conviction reigns that the existing boundaries are not final. Everywhere is to be found a really mystical belief that some event not yet foreseen, a successful revolution or a new war, will and

must alter the present frontiers. There is a general distrust of the League of Nations, from which nothing is expected; hopes are laid for the most part on violent solutions.

The majority peoples on their part find it in their interests that the present frontiers should remain as they are and they rely on the League of Nations, powerful armaments, "security" treaties with the Western Powers, and partly on an unwise and violent treatment of the minorities. This situation makes international disarmament impossible.

Some twenty-six treaties providing defensive alliances have been registered with the League since the end of the World War. Most of these treaties have been arranged between nations victorious in the War, who depend on the new alliances to safeguard advantages, mainly territorial, gained in the conflict. It is not without significance that these treaties have continued to come into effect regularly, over a period of ten years. As lately as 1926 the greatest number were signed of any single year.[9]

A test? A tidal wave of trouble! Yet, if the League cannot meet the trouble when it comes, war is absolutely certain, war impossible to segregate; and to posterity this League will be another "Holy" Terror.

If, however, it can rectify injustice, if it can gracefully relinquish old feuds, if it can grant ever-increasing equality of status to the exploited races and peoples, if it can hold a Mussolini back from incitement to war and prevent a line-up of capitalistic states bent on demolishing revolutionary Russia—it will be a boon the like of which seers long have hoped for.

The present outlook for such a performance is neither bright nor hopeless. The United States has remained outside from a mixture of motives, provincial, pacific, good, bad, indifferent. Yet with us in or out, until the League is definitely and completely disassociated from the principle of preserving peace by throwing fear of war into a possible offender, it will never be a real League of Peace at all. The dogs of war are not safe guardians for the house of peace. When once let loose, they bite without discrimination.

A peace movement that starts out to keep peace by allowing

war-to-end-war and which continues to tolerate the threat of legalized conflict as a central feature, suffers a tremendous handicap. To remove the sanctions of military force now endangering the League's future and the safety of civilization, is the first responsibility of all believers in the value of pacific world organization.

And even then, a League alone would be far from enough. More is required, a different approach, a much more vital guarantee of peace. In the war on war, organization is essential; but beyond organization, we have to fight. The how and when and what of that high struggle remains for consideration later on.

CHAPTER VII

ARBITRATION'S LONG CAREER

What an amazing way of trying controversies! What must mankind be, before such a thing as war could ever be known or thought of upon earth? How shocking, how inconceivable a want must there have been of common understanding, as well as common humanity, before any two Governors, or any two nations in the universe, could once think of such a method of decision?—JOHN WESLEY, *The Doctrine of Original Sin according to Scripture, Reason and Experience.*

CHAPTER VII

ARBITRATION'S LONG CAREER

THE human race has never tasted peace. War has at times been limited; yet chiefly checked, however, by the nations' inability to fight. The interregnums in the bloody rule of Mars have not been years of peace, but only breathing spells. As the *Encyclopedia Britannica* (13th edition) puts it, in discussing peace, "its sense in international law is the condition of not being at war."

A catalogue of mankind's wars would take a volume. The prevalence of conflict up to the birth of the organized peace movement is strikingly shown by the wars between France and England only. In the following table the years when war broke out are given in the left-hand column; each war's duration is stated at the right.[1] In Europe there are two distinct periods known as the hundred years' wars.

War Began	*Continued, Years*
1110	2
1141	1
1161	25
1211	15
1224	19
1292	5
1332	21
1368	52
1422	49
1492	1 month
1512	2
1521	6
1549	1
1557	2
1562	2

War Began	*Continued, Years*
1627	2
1665	1
1689	10
1702	11
1744	4
1756	7
1776	7
1793	9
1803	12

Twenty-four wars, occupying 265 years out of 705, and between these two nations alone! Wars with other powers excluded; civil wars left out; and yet between two countries, allies in the last great spree, hate and slaughter amounting to more than 37½ per cent or three-eighths of their total intercourse!

Between the Napoleonic Wars ending in 1815 and January 1, 1930, the nations of the world precipitated at least 252 conflicts, classified roughly as follows: Wars of Great Magnitude, 9; Smaller but Large Scale Wars, 49; Other Conflicts, 194. This averages well over two new outbreaks every year. (See Appendix I.)

All this time the idea of arbitration has been known; and it has solved a multitude of minor questions. Could you chart the difference between the additional wars mankind might have summoned means to carry on, and the wars stopped by some form of arbitration, you would find the area far too meager for your satisfaction.

Most of the early schemes for peace contained the arbitral idea.

Fénelon, writing in 1699 his *Adventures of Telemachus,* advised a young prince to seek arbitration rather than carry out what he alone deemed best. Came back the olden, modern query: "Am I not a sovereign Prince? And is a sovereign to leave the extent of his dominions to the decision of foreigners?"

The answer is symbolic; for on the reef of sovereignty, quintessence of nationalism, plans for arbitration have more than one time foundered. That stalwart Episcopalian, the late Admiral Mahan, well knew the fact, and fairly reveled in it.

"It is possible," he said, "that we have before us a period of transition, wherein the strong sentiment of nationality may prove simply the conservative force which by delaying shall steady the onward movement toward the logical consummation of arbitration without finally preventing it. . . ." [2]

Steady the onward movement? Let those who can, show where the progress of peaceful international relations has been "steadied" by that "pooled self-esteem," as Clutton-Brock once called it,[3] we know as nationalism; but which is known to militaristic minds as "independent nationality, which has played so great a beneficial part in the history of European civilization for the past four hundred years." [4]

Back in the misty origins of ancient Greece, King Amphictyon and the amphictyonies relied on arbitration. Arbitration likewise was a practice of the Achæan and Lycian Leagues. King Darius of Persia (who ruled 521-486 B.C.) decided a contest between Artabazanes and Xerxes; after his death, the issue not being entirely cleared by his decision, Artabanus or Artaphernes, uncle of the two pretenders, acted as arbitral judge, deciding in favor of Xerxes. Another Artaphernes, Satrap of Sardis, following a defeat of the Ionians, made the deputies of the conquered cities sign an arbitration compact to settle controversies by law instead of arms.

Among themselves the Greeks also employed arbitration, mainly in reference to religious or territorial questions. Solon (born 638 B.C.?) brought about an arbitration, under five judges, between the Athenians and the Megarians over the ownership of the Island of Salamis. The Cimolians and Melians engaged in a dispute over certain islands, settled about 416 B.C. by arbitration. A boundary dispute between the cities of Melite and Pera in Thessaly was arbitrated by the Ætolians. A similar issue between the Corcyreans and the Corinthians was arbitrated by Themistocles (who died about 460 B.C.). The city of Mitylene, when appointed arbitrator by King Antigonus (who died about 301 B.C.), resolved a contest between the inhabitants of Teos and people of Lebedos who had recently settled there. A very important case, disobedience in which was responsible

for a disastrous war, was the arbitral judgment of five hundred talents granted by the Sicyonians to the Oropians against the Athenians.

Thucidydes, in his history of the Peloponnesian War, quotes Archidamus, King of Sparta, who said: "It is impossible to attack as a transgressor him who offers to lay his grievance before a tribunal of arbitration." Pontarcus, famed as a wrestler, arbitrated an issue between the Eleans and the Achæans; and Pittalus, winner of the Olympic games, judged a dispute between the Eleans and the Arcadians. Simonides, the poet, is said to have prevented a war between Hiero of Syracuse and Theron of Agrigentum. The Oracle of Delphi several times arbitrated differences. A treaty between Argos and Lacedæmonia contained a clause providing for arbitration of contentions. Similarly the cities of Hyerapytna and Priansus provided between them definite arbitral machinery.

The Romans, on the other hand, were less interested in arbitration, though there are records of many appeals to the arbitrament of the dictator-emperors, or of the Roman senate. For a time, outside nations ventured to resort to the pomp and power of Rome as an arbitrator of their differences; but they soon learned the unwisdom of that course. In one instance, Rome decided a dispute over possession of certain territory between the Aricians and the Ardeans by grabbing the land for itself. Again, about 180 B.C. a dispute between Nola and Naples was "settled" in the same expeditious manner.

In the "barbarian" world, arbitration appears to have been common. The Gepidæ, a Germanic tribe, once offered arbitration to the Lombards; Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths (about 454-526 A.D.), invited the Kings of the Herculians and Varnes to join in a proposal of arbitration to Clovis, King of the Franks, and his enemies the Visigoths—a move that was successful.

The Popes were often asked to serve as arbitrators in the Middle Ages, their pontifical dignity and overlordship lending prestige to the decisions. Most of these settlements were of minor, personal, or local significance; but occasionally there

loomed up grave intersectional crises. Wars of some magnitude were prevented or at least delayed. A well-known case of settlement is the imaginary line drawn from Pole to Pole by Pope Alexander VI (who ruled 1492-1503) to divide the newly found lands in the Western Hemisphere between Spain and Portugal. Also possessing a power generally thought to be derived more directly from on high than that of temporal rulers, Bishops often were requested to arbitrate. The emperors of the Holy Roman Empire sought to exercise a similar power but were involved in too many intrigues to be often trusted. Feudal lords were often chosen to arbitrate between their vassals. Cities, though rarely, were asked to judge between other contending cities, and the parliaments of France occasionally settled disputes between foreign rulers. Sometimes a commission of arbitration would be set up by the disputants, and once in a while some internationally famous jurisconsult would be sought out as a referee. Arbitration was a practice of the Hanseatic League.

In a treaty of alliance, 1235, between Venice and Genoa, one article reads:

> If a difficulty should arise between the aforesaid cities, which cannot easily be settled by themselves, it shall be decided by the arbitration of the Sovereign Pontiff; and if one of the parties violates the treaty, we agree that His Holiness shall excommunicate the offending city.

With the relative decline of the Papacy's power and with waves of war sweeping relentlessly over Europe, arbitration fell out even of such fashion as it had been in.[5] It continued to hold only casual favor until the end of the nineteenth century. De Bustamente, in his book on *The World Court,* lists the following table of arbitrations throughout the world, taken from a French compiler:

From 1789 to 1840, there were 23 arbitrations, or 1 every 2 years.
From 1841 to 1860, there were 20, or 1 a year.
From 1861 to 1880, there were 44, or 2 a year.
From 1881 to 1900, there were 90, or over 4½ a year.

In 1794 John Jay, our Secretary of State, negotiated with Great Britain a treaty of amity, commerce, and navigation which drew world-wide comment.

Needless to say, it attracted attention in the new United States. One-hundred-per-cent Americans burned Jay in effigy, and killed any chance of his landing in the White House.

In the first petition to Congress, 1837 (referred to in Chapter VI), the petitioners asked not only for steps toward a Congress of Nations and a World Court, but arbitration: arbitration in general; and in particular, arbitration of the pending disputes with Mexico.

The petition was turned down flat by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which discovered, among other things, a danger from the Holy Alliance, long so jubilantly hailed by the peace societies, and praised even less than a year before (1836) by *The American Advocate of Peace* and the Windham County (Connecticut), Peace Society. Was ever a more typical urbane rebuff handed to any group of non-political humanitarians? The Committee concluded

> by recommending to the memorialists to persevere in exerting whatever influence they may possess over public opinion, to dispose it habitually to the accommodation of national differences without bloodshed.

To the House it moved

> that the Committee be discharged from the further consideration of the subject referred to them.[6]

And that—you can almost hear them rubbing their hands—was that.

It was. But the flood of petitions did not cease. From that time forward, the busy warriors on war kept matters hot for the timid men at Washington.

Again the Legislature of Massachusetts was faithful to its vision. In 1844, in reply to a single petitioner, it took a stronger stand for peace than hitherto. After roundly condemning war and declaring that "if any method can be devised for the set-

tlement of national controversies without the evils of war, the adoption of that method is a consummation devoutly to be wished," it expressed the opinion that

> . . . the peace societies formed in this country and in Europe within the last twenty-eight years and enrolling some of the purest and most gifted minds in either hemisphere, have poured the light of reason and revelation upon the practice of war, until multitudes have come to the conclusion, that a custom so fraught with evil, and so hostile to the first principles of religion, *cannot be necessary*. It begins to be extensively acknowledged, that *individuals* and *communities* are subject to the same divine authority, and are bound to conduct their affairs and regulate their mutual intercourse on the same principles; and therefore, that legal adjudication should take the place of physical force, for the maintenance of national rights and interests, as it has already with regard to those of a personal and domestic nature. . . .
>
> We regard arbitration as a practical and desirable substitute for war in the adjustment of international differences.[7]

Meantime William Jay, gracious son of an illustrious sire, and President of the American Peace Society, had been campaigning for "stipulated arbitration." In 1842 he said:

> Suppose in our next (commercial) treaty with France an article were inserted of the following import—"It is agreed between the contracting parties that if, unhappily, any controversy shall hereafter arise between them in respect to the true meaning and intention of any stipulation in this present treaty or in respect to any other subject, which controversy cannot be satisfactorily adjusted by negotiation, neither party shall resort to hostilities against the other; but the matter of dispute shall, by a special convention, be submitted to the arbitrament of one or more friendly powers; and the parties hereby agree to abide by the award which may be given in pursuance to such submission."[8]

Not even the august prestige of William Jay nor the forceful benignity of his oratorical efforts, however, so much as dented the crusty exterior of Congress. Still struggling manfully, Jay and the more radical laborers who were coöperating in the common fight, were obliged to watch impotently, for the time being, while the slave-holding South won the reactionary Polk to open war with Mexico.

Nevertheless, at the close of that disgraceful buccaneering raid, in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo signed in 1848 an article (21) was inserted not as a sop to arbitration sentiment but to secure Mexico's more willing adherence.[9] Though Article 21 may have inspired the minor arbitration settlements of 1868, 1897, and 1902, nevertheless when United States-Mexican relations were strained in 1927 almost to the point of war (from this side of the border), the government of our country ignored the expressed willingness of Mexico's Secretary of Foreign Affairs to resort to a mixed commission, and substantially declared with an almost contemptuous disdain that there was nothing to arbitrate.

In so doing, this country did not violate the treaty, which does not make arbitration mandatory. In 1914, President Wilson had ignored a similar suggestion from Huerta's spokesman, and sent our troops to Vera Cruz.

Up to the Civil War, in all, the House denied three resolutions appealing for arbitration, and the Senate two.[10]

The Free Soil Party in 1852 adopted a plank which read:

> We recommend the introduction into all treaties hereafter to be negotiated between the United States and foreign nations of some provision for amicable settlement of difficulties by a resort to decisive arbitration.

In February, 1853, the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs adopted a resolution reading:

> Resolved, that the Senate advise the President to secure, whenever it may be practicable, a stipulation in all treaties hereafter entered into with other nations, providing for the adjustment of any misunderstanding or controversy which may arise between the contracting parties, by referring the same to the decision of disinterested and impartial arbitrators, to be mutually chosen.

That got no farther. But on June 5, 1854, a treaty was consummated between Great Britain and the United States laying down the limits of fishing grounds. There was in this treaty an arbitration clause:

The Commissioners shall name some third person to act as an arbitrator or umpire in any case or cases on which they may themselves differ in opinion.

The high contracting parties hereby solemnly engage to consider the decision of the commissioners conjointly, or of the arbitrator or umpire, as the case may be, as absolutely final and conclusive, in each case decided upon by them or him respectively.

As the poisons of bitterness, intrigue, oppression and unreason swept the country on to that dread schism of 1861, peace work slowed up, peace sentiments were hushed, peace principles were pocketed—as usual, "for the duration of the war."

In 1871, however, with the favorable award, by arbitration, of the Alabama claims against Great Britain, once more the public's open-mindedness revived; revived also the hope and working energy of the movement for world peace.

Ever since May 31 of the "Alabama year," Charles Sumner had labored to get an arbitration resolution through the Senate. He could not do it, influential though he was. On March 11, 1874, he died. And then on the final day of the session, June 23, the Senate passed a resolution consisting of nothing but the third point in the more thoroughgoing Sumner resolution, and failed to consider a resolution passed by the House, also more meaningful. The House's resolution read:

Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives [the resolution was to be concurrent], That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to negotiate with all civilized powers who may be willing to enter into such negotiation for the establishment of an international system whereby matters in dispute between different governments agreeing thereto may be adjusted by arbitration, and if possible, without recourse to war.[11]

So far, this was the high-water mark of official arbitration sentiment. It never became law, but it did fill the movement with renewed good cheer when encouragement was sorely needed.

It was not until the electoral campaign of 1876 that arbitration made any impression, since 1852, on the platform build-

ers of the parties. In that year the Prohibition Reform Party, forerunner of the Prohibition Party—and, incidentally, inaugurator of many progressive planks adopted later by the larger parties—declared for

> The introduction into all treaties hereafter negotiated with foreign governments of a provision for the amicable settlement of international difficulties by arbitration.[12]

Blaine, the Republican candidate in 1884, was supported heartily by the peace forces; for he had declared himself a believer in arbitration. *The Messenger of Peace,* a journal of the Friends, then published at New Vienna, Ohio, called

> the attention of all the Christian people . . . to the great importance of their encouraging the Republican Party . . . in the glorious and greatly needed work of binding all the nations of the earth as soon as it can be done in bonds of peace by the reasonable and philanthropic power of arbitration.

At the great convention of "Friends, Tunkers, Mennonites, and Advocates of Peace and Arbitration" at Mystic, Connecticut, in August, 1884, the Reverend Dr. R. McMurdy, Corresponding Secretary of the National Arbitration League, aroused no little public comment by a ringing endorsement of Blaine.

But the Reverend Dr. Burchard's outburst about the Democrats as the party of "rum, Romanism, and rebellion," along with a strong Democratic war chest, floored Blaine forever, as a presidential candidate.

Prompted by an appeal from the French Society of the Friends of Peace to all civilized countries, a new wave of arbitration endeavor rolled up, especially in this country and in England. Under the persuasion of Andrew Carnegie a delegation from the British Parliament memorialized President Cleveland in favor of arbitration treaties and Mr. Cleveland replied with a response undeniably courteous and open-minded, but vague, tradition-bound, and clearly none too hopeful.

Let Mr. Carnegie tell the story of what followed as he recounted the stirring events of the period in his letter of 1910,

transmitting $10,000,000 to the trustees of the Carnegie Peace Foundation. Responsibility for the spelling I hasten to place on the author of the missive, who was an advocate not only of peace but of orthographic reform as well:

I call your attention to the following resolution introduced by the Committee of Foreign Relations in the First Session, Fiftieth Congress, June 14, 1888:

> Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), that the President be, and is hereby, requested to invite, from time to time, as fit occasions may arise, negotiations with any government, with which the United States has or may have diplomatic relations, to the end that any differences or disputes arising between the two governments which cannot be adjusted by diplomatic agency may be referred to arbitration and be peaceably adjusted by such means (Resolution not reached on calendar during session, but reintroduced and passed: Senate, February 14, 1890; House, April 3, 1890).

This resolution was presented to the British Parliament, which adopted a resolution, approving the action of the Congress of the United States and expressing the hope that Her Majesty's Government would lend their ready cooperation to the Government of the United States for the accomplishment of the object in view (Resolution of the House of Commons July 16, 1893, Foreign Relations, 1893, 346, 352).

Here we find an expression of the spirit which resulted in the first international Hague Conference of 1898; the second Hague Conference of 1907; and eighty treaties of obligatory arbitration between the great nations of the world, our own country being a party to twenty-three of them.

It was my privilege to introduce to President Cleveland in 1887 a Committee of Members of the Parliament of Britain, headed by Sir William Randal Cremer, in response to the action of Congress, proposing a treaty agreeing to settle all disputes that mite arise between America and Great Britain by arbitration. Such a treaty was concluded between Lord Pauncefore and Secretary Olney in 1897. It faild of approval by the necessary two-thirds majority of the Senate by only three votes.

And "faild," the man of steel and peace might well have added, after some of the most pitiful exhibitions of jingoism ever indulged in by a war-wed Congress. A House, for exam-

ple, whose Foreign Relations Committee rendered a lukewarm, defeatist report damning arbitration with faint praise; and also a minority report expressing the noble conviction that

> we will be purblind if we relax our attitude and accept a paper guaranty of peace in place of the moral and military forces that are the supreme elements of strength in our splendid Republic.[13]

Notoriously the Senate has been for years the graveyard of pacific international agreements. It would require more space than this chapter can preëmpt to tell the whole story of arbitration's experiences on the threshold of that mortuary. In the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* July, 1928, Professor Philip C. Jessup has just about "told all"—even to quoting a pungent comment by John Bassett Moore after the Senate had cantankerously asserted its prerogatives in regard to the treaties following the 1907 Hague Convention: "The result of this action is that, so far as the United States is concerned, it is now in actual practice more difficult to secure international arbitration than it was in the early days of our independence."

We have often said No to appeals by other countries that disputes to which we were a party be settled by arbitration. Our war with Mexico followed such a refusal. Our war with Spain followed a refusal to arbitrate the question of who was responsible for sinking the *Maine* in Havana Harbor; and we followed the war by a refusal to arbitrate the question of the Cuban debt and our possession of the Philippine Islands. We refused Colombia's request that we arbitrate our seizing of Panama. We refused to arbitrate the passport controversy with Russia in 1911, and in 1913 we refused to arbitrate with Great Britain the question of the Panama Canal Tolls Act. We would not arbitrate with Huerta in 1914 our demand that the Mexican president salute the Stars and Stripes. In 1917 we refused to arbitrate our right to make the Bryan-Chamorro Treaty with Nicaragua, which was held invalid by the Central American Court of Justice. Professor J. W. Garner, in his excellent work on *American Foreign Policies,* after considering our rec-

ord, asks whether, "until we catch up with the procession and show by our acts our faith in arbitration and judicial settlement, we can continue to claim a leadership which no longer belongs to us. . . ."

The First Hague Conference of 1899 broke the ice of national isolation; but it amounted to little in terms of peace; its labors were primarily devoted to making war polite. At this Conference the United States rejected the ban on poison gas. All disarmament proposals—first in order on the agenda of the Tsar whose rescript brought about the meeting—failed utterly. The Conference did, however, promote the procedure of mediation, conciliation, and inquiry, and established the Hague Tribunal—a court not totally devoid of usefulness, but which between its inception and the outbreak of the World War handled only cases of extremely minor character.

Though the Second Hague Conference of 1907 brought into its sessions all the countries of the so-called civilized world except Honduras, Costa Rica, and Abyssinia, nevertheless as stated by Charles A. and Mary R. Beard,

> . . . the fatal animus of the powers was clearly manifest at the second conference when practically the only points on which concord could be reached were new rules for "civilized warfare," legal rules which were soon to be treated by them all as mere scraps of paper, incapable of restraining armed forces facing each other.[14]

Yet so sure of their accomplishment were the peace forces, so jubilantly certain that war was on the run, that they seized with glee a skeptical bit of newspaper verse which illustrates, as Edward Everett Hale was saying in 1905 before the second Conference, "what was thought of the Hague Tribunal *for a while*":

A soldier of the powers was on picket in Algiers,
(Or China—any place you choose that finds a rhyme for tears);
The battle had been bloody and the rival armies lay
On gory blades, preparing for another one next day.
A figure from the darkness crept, a figure stern and grim,
Approached the watchful picket where he stood, and spoke to him:
"I pray you bear this message to the powers, where they lie,
For I'm the Hague Tribunal, and I've come to say good-bye!

"Pray, Soldier, drop a tear for me, and bless me ere I go;
I tried to take your job away, but you'll forgive I know.
Men petted me and cherished me, and cried me for a boon,
But now I see that I was born a century too soon.

We part and may not meet again; I bid you my farewell,
And when again you see the powers, soldier, you may tell—
Tell them—" his voice was broken and he smothered a great sob,
"Just tell them when you saw me, I was looking for a job!" [15]

Between the 1905 of Hale's exultant assurance and the 1914 of the verse's vindication, arbitration treaties had been negotiated by the United States with other powers: by Elihu Root, as Roosevelt's Secretary of State, twenty-five treaties, of which three were never fully made effective, and eleven of which were permitted to lapse; by Philander C. Knox, as Taft's Secretary of State, two treaties with Great Britain and France respectively; by William Jennings Bryan, Mr. Wilson's Secretary of State, twenty-one.[16] Some of these were not put into operating condition. Mr. Kellogg assiduously promoted the signing of a great many new treaties all of a rather weak character, and he also reconstituted the Bryan commissions for conciliation. In the Pan American Arbitration Congress which closed on January 5, 1929, the United States delegates signed a treaty which could doubtless prove of real value in Latin American relations, and which goes further toward compulsory arbitration than any previous commitment. If ratified by the Senate, this treaty would mark a noteworthy forward step.

Yet the fact is, not a single treaty to which the United States is committed binds us to arbitrate *all* questions, and in the last analysis, only such treaties matter very much.

We do not lead: we lag. Even prior to 1917, a half dozen bilateral treaties actually banning war *over any dispute whatever* were in force in Europe and Latin America; since the War two dozen or more such thorough treaties have been effected.[17]

Not one of our treaties, however, fails to provide some loophole whereby arbitration may be dodged. Either by invoking our sacred and inviolable "honor" or by simply declaring, as with reference to Mexico in 1927, that there is nothing to arbi-

trate, we can reduce—we have reduced—these treaties to the level of mere gestures. We believe in them when they apply to minor matters—but do not choose to heed them when the issues really count. About seventy-five times we have been party to such small-stake arbitral negotiations, some of the machinery being established outside of treaties.[18] While it is possible that these matters might have led to war, it is probable that few if any of them would. And in that same period of time, we have also had war and war and war and war.

Is arbitration useless? Only when it deceives with false assurance. As a means of educating popular opinion for internationalism; as a stimulus to further international regulations to tie up war-makers and make their alibis a little harder to concoct; as a written expression of an international morality and world responsibility felt by increasing numbers of the people, treaties of arbitration, conciliation and mediation have a genuine part in peace.

But they are not enough. Arbitration by itself is a precarious safeguard. Something more potent held in reserve; something less easily circumvented by inept and cynical men in foreign offices without detection by the people until it is too late; some power that speaks peremptorily to war and says, "No further shall you come!" is still required.

CHAPTER VIII

HUMAN NATURE VS. HUMAN NATURE

From whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members?—APOSTLE JAMES, iv. 1.

CHAPTER VIII

HUMAN NATURE VS. HUMAN NATURE

"THERE is no animal so strange as man," says the dour Carlyle in his *French Revolution.* Strange indeed! for mingled with man's defiant egotism, his courage to risk his life in combat, his ceaseless conquest of natural forces, is a strain of abject self-depreciation.

Toward many of his problems man's attitude has been defeatist; but toward none so much as toward himself. He has scaled mountains, flung himself through air and burrowed for desired objects deep through layered rock; but in his own weak nature he has often seen one thing not to be conquered, too unregenerate for hope.

The doctrines of infant damnation and total depravity had their day, as pseudo-Darwinian ruthlessness and Freudian demonology have been having theirs. Far back in the primitive glories of Israel the songster twanged his lute and queried dolefully, "What is man, that Thou art mindful of him?" And they did not estimate then, as we do now, that the earth is no less than 250,000,000,000,000,000 miles away from the center of our universe!

There need be scant wonder that in the efforts of war-scarred peoples to discover why violence cursed the world, they should seize on that naïve explanation: human nature. No single quotation from Scripture was used in the literature of the early peace movement with such continuous reiteration as the lugubrious analysis of the Apostle James. It figures in almost every speech, article, tract, or book. Again and again the warriors on war gathered about the camp fire to begin their incantations with James' stern warning of lusts, though to end on Isaiah's bright prophecy of pruning hooks and plowshares.

Most certainly there is no warrant for the fairly common assumption that the current interest in the psychological basis of war is new. The approach is often different to-day and, of course, the terminology. The old-time inquirers did not probe man's behavior in the laboratory manner; nor did they write about "neuroses of the nations." It is absolutely incorrect, however, to say that the founders of the peace movement were not seeking to discover and eradicate the causes of conflict in the make-up of man.

It was easy when men sang glumly, "Oh! what a worm am I," to see an obvious cause for war in human nature. It is a little more difficult to see why so simple an explanation should continue to command respect to-day. The influence of those truculent high priests of the survival of the fittest—Treitschke, Bernhardi, Cramb, and Roosevelt—has been discredited in biology and social relations. Even the single-track psychologists have moved on far from the uncritical adaptations of Freud, and man, if not a subject for rhapsody, need not be cause for absolute despair.

Neither chronic dyspepsia nor the widening influence of Mr. Mencken's cynicized minority are adequate grounds why estimable people should evade the complexities of war causes and take refuge in such an easy simplification as human nature. The reason, it seems to me, is to be found perhaps in the overwhelming reluctance of these moderns to make basic social readjustments; rather than change social customs and institutions radically, they prefer to stagger along, putting the blame on the devil. In olden garb or new, the devil is always a comforting symbol to the conventional-minded.

Says General J. G. Harbord:

> Permanent universal peace still remains as an ideal lost in inaccessible distance, until envy, malice, lust and avarice have disappeared from the human heart.[1]

The late Judge Elbert H. Gary voiced the lament of the prosperity worshiper:

> Human nature is selfish and apt to forget what is really for the

best interests of every country—that is, to maintain peace is the thing that encourages, maintains, and sustains prosperity.[2]

It is obviously a great deal simpler for General Harbord to ascribe the blame for war to the human heart than to renounce war and refuse further to take part in it. It was also simpler for Mr. Gary to lambaste human nature than refuse to make munitions or to attack the use of military forces, say, for the safeguarding of foreign investments.

I find it difficult, however, on any other ground than sheer disillusionment to account for Mr. John Carter's attempt, in *Man Is War,* to share the cynical view of human nature enjoyed by the best minds of all ages among the militarists, profiteers, slave drivers, and inventive theologians. Mr. Carter only a few years ago wrote in defense of youth. And now? Says Mr. Carter:

> The heart of man begot the Roman legion and the Roman law, the Christian ethic and the Spanish Inquisition, the instrument of commercial credit and the practise of commercial war. Men have fathered the theory of liberty, equality, and fraternity, the guillotine and the Cheka. Man has created the frescoes of the Sistine Chapel and mustard gas. For everything begotten of man shares the nature of man and is as apt to destruction as to creation.
>
> The world will escape the blight of war when man has ceased to be human. The world will find peace when man is extinct.[3]

This last paragraph is a neat little epigram which the first paragraph proves to be all too neat and simple. The Inquisition is behind us; the church that forced Galileo to recant and denied the Copernican astronomy, whatever else may be said against it, now maintains expensive astronomical observatories and alone among religious bodies keeps abreast of new discoveries in the visible skies. The score of mankind's newer foolishness would make a large book; but not so large as the old follies long since laid aside. The golden age of man may lie far off in dim futurity; but as Mr. Carter would agree, it assuredly never existed in the pain-filled past.

One thing is certain about the relation of human nature to war; and that is, that peace has not yet been effected by senti-

mentally low ideas of human capacity, that victories are not born of defeatist states of mind. Neither man as incorruptible angel nor as devil all depraved is a stimulating concept. Disillusioned humanitarians as well as cynical traditionalists have harped on the theme of fallen man for a century or more, but with little helpful effect for peace.

Grotius had declared man "a creature most dear to God." But David Low Dodge, touched by the icy finger of Calvinism, felt less enthusiastic. "An inspired apostle," said he, "has informed us whence come wars and fightings. They come from the lusts of men that war in their members. Ever since the fall, mankind have had naturally within them a spirit of pride, avarice, and revenge." [4] The Reverend Benjamin Bell in a fiery denunciation of the War of 1812, delivered in 1813, enumerated the causes of wars as follows: 1. Pride, 2. A covetous spirit, or an inordinate love of the world, 3. Revenge, 4. Idleness, 5. Debtors who try to overthrow governments by war talk, thus escaping their financial obligations, 6. Desire in rulers for increase of power and influence.[5]

Noah Worcester thought very differently. In his *Solemn Review* he said:

> That there is nothing in the nature of mankind, which renders war necessary and unavoidable—nothing which inclines them to it, which may not be overcome by the power of education, may appear from what is discoverable in the two sects already mentioned. The Quakers and Shakers are of the same nature with other people, "men of like passions" with those who uphold the custom of war. All the difference between them and others results from education and habit. The principles of their teachers are diffused through their societies, impressed on the minds of old and young; and an aversion to war and violence is excited, which becomes habitual, and has a governing influence on their hearts, their passions and their lives.

Nurture versus nature, the olden conflict stated in terms refreshingly alien to psychological laboratories. There were not many to agree with Worcester, even in the loyal ranks of the peace societies, still less outside. Thomas Williams in 1815

pulled an over-vertical face still longer and anticipated General Harbord by a century and more:

> It is certain, that war will exist, so long as the nations of the earth retain that character with which the human race are born into the world.[6]

John Jay, who ought to have known better, wrote to Noah Worcester from Bedford, New York, on November 12, 1817:

> Until the Gospel shall have extensively corrected the hereditary depravity of mankind, the wickedness resulting from it, will in my opinion, continue to produce national sins and national punishments; and by causing unjust wars and other culpable practices, to render just wars occasionally indispensable.[7]

Thomas Dawes later in the same year answered back, however, in his speech before the Massachusetts Peace Society:

> Though wars and fightings arise from the passions of men, they are not therefore always inevitable. The same apostle who asks "whence came they" answers his own questions and prescribes the remedy. He exhorts the twelve tribes then scattered abroad to cleanse their hands and purify their hearts.[8]

William Ladd in 1823 was writing papers for *The Christian Mirror* (as "Philanthropos") some of which indicate a lively interest in the causes of war: "Warlike Ambition or a Love of Military Glory," "The Present System of Education a Cause of Warlike Ambition," "The Militia System a Cause of War," "Preparation for War Often the Cause of It," "The Influence of the Female Sex Often Exerted in Favor of War." In 1828, the "Apostle of Peace" focused all these, perhaps because of his close contact with naval seamen and the militia encampments of Maine and Massachusetts, on one central cause: "The love of military glory is a cause of war, greater than all others put together."[9]

In 1834, the Reverend C. S. Henry of Hartford told the Windham County (Connecticut) Peace Society:

> The causes of war exist in the corrupt passions of human nature.[10]

Stephen Thurston in 1838 delivered himself of this analysis:

The lust of dominion, the lust of wealth, the lust of power, the lust of fame or glory, and the lust of revenge, have ever been the most prolific causes of war.[11]

On and on, thus went the argument, up to the appearance of the *Origin of Species,* from which time *homo sapiens* seemed a constitutional roughneck, and to Prince Kropotkin's *Mutual Aid a Factor of Evolution,*[12] George W. Nasmyth's *Social Progress and the Darwinian Theory,*[13] and the impact of the new science of psychology on the strait-laced biology of the non-gay 'nineties. Beecher, shocked at the Franco-Prussian War, turned fierce oratorical irony upon a mentally squirming congregation, saying:

War is not an acute disease which can be cured by special remedies. It is a constitutional disorder. It belongs to human nature. It is the remnant in man of that old fighting animal from which Mr. Darwin says we sprang. One might find some presumption in favor of this theory from the fact that there is so much of the animal left in us yet. It has been supposed that we sprang from monkeys; and there has been an inquisition to see if there has not been a caudal appendage rubbed off. Nations have been explored to find a man who had a tail, as a monkey has, or some traces of one. You are looking in the wrong place. Look inside, and you will find resemblances to the monkey, the lion, the tiger, the bear, and the hog, all of them.[14]

Toward the end of the last century Guy de Maupassant, remembering his ten years at clerical work in France's navy department, and touched even then perhaps by the depression which was later in accentuated form to drive him into lunacy and early death, reached the acme of despair over docile, stupid human beings:

The most surprising thing is that the whole of society does not rise up at the very mention of war.

We shall therefore continue to live under the burden of the old, repulsive customs of criminal prejudices, of the wild conceptions of our barbarous forefathers. We are therefore animals and shall continue to be animals, who are governed by our instincts, and whom nothing can change.[15]

No one can prudently fail to admit that if peace depends upon this interpretation of human nature, and if human nature cannot be changed, we are in for scientific roughhouse forevermore. Nor can one rationally deny that there is something in human nature that isn't as good as it might be.

Even human nature can see that. And because it observes the folly of the race, it proves itself not purely foolish.

Anyone can see that Ladd was right, for example, in ascribing war in part to a love for military glory, even though he gave it overemphasis. As familiar a student of war as Brevet Major General Emory Upton, whose work on *The Military Policy of the United States,* written almost half a century ago, has been reprinted four times and still serves as a sort of Old Testament to army gospel, commented thus on the rewards of military success, which serve, of course, as a constant example to the ambitious:

> Our own people, no less than the Romans, are fond of rewarding our military heroes. The Revolution made Washington President for two terms; the War of 1812 elevated Jackson and Harrison to the same office, the first for two terms, the latter for one; the Mexican War raised Taylor and Pierce to the Presidency, each for one term; the Rebellion has already made Grant President for two terms, Hayes for one term, while the present Chief Magistrate, Garfield, owes his high office as much to his fame as a soldier as to his reputation as a statesman.
>
> Long wars do not reward the highest commanders only. After the Revolution Knox, Dearborn and Armstrong rose to the office of Secretary of War; Hamilton was Secretary of the Treasury; while Monroe, first Secretary of State, was finally elected President for two terms. During the Rebellion nearly 150 regular officers rose to the grade of brigadier and major general who, but for the four years' struggle, would have been unknown outside the military profession.
>
> Since the war, distinguished officers of volunteers have filled nearly every office in the gift of the people. They have been elected chief magistrates of their States, and today on both floors of Congress they are conspicuous alike for their numbers and influence.

The Spanish-American War raised up its Roosevelt and the World War delivered itself of Dawes. Must we blame this on

human nature? Every last one of these beneficiaries, in all probability, sincerely considered himself as a Moses for his people; nor have the leaders of peace movements always been teetotally ambitionless. No greater mistake could be made, even if it were not sublimely pharisaical, to assume that the soldiery, from the humblest private down to swashbuckling admirals, are ruled on the whole by any other than laudable motives. Most of the hideous deeds perpetrated by human beings, for that matter, from the Inquisition to the sanctimonious lynchings in our Southern states, have been inspired by the *shrecklichkeit* of righteous but miseducated impulse.

Human beings do not wage or foster war because they are depraved. Increasingly, men will not fight except for causes that can be made to appeal to their ideals, however misdirected those ideals may be. No longer do armies of mercenary troops pillage alien lands for the whim of an equally alien employer; it takes conscription to drive men into war, and the passionate appeal of nationalism or the lure of a world ideal to reconcile them to their slavery.

The term "human nature," as generally used, means all sorts of things. It may mean original nature, that is, man's inherited psychological equipment; or it may mean his cultural, standardized, group ways of acting—which many people thoughtlessly confuse with so-called original nature.

In reality human nature consists of both elements. The cynics find little justification in such a view as that of Professor Charles H. Cooley, a respected student of human nature:

> By human nature we may understand those sentiments and impulses that are human in being superior to those of lower animals, and also in the sense that they belong to mankind at large, and not to any particular race or time. It means, particularly, sympathy and the innumerable sentiments into which sympathy enters, such as love, resentment, ambition, vanity, hero-worship, and the feeling of social right and wrong. . . .
>
> Human nature is not something existing separately in the individual, but a *group nature or primary phase of society,* a relatively simple and general condition of the social mind. It is something more, on the one hand, than the mere instinct that is born in

us—though that enters into it—and something less, on the other, than the more elaborate development of ideas and sentiments that makes up institutions. . . . Man does not have it at birth; he cannot acquire it except through fellowship and it decays in isolation.[16]

Professor Dewey crisply declares, "Those who argue that social and moral reform is impossible on the ground that the old Adam of human nature remains forever the same, attribute however to native activities the permanence and inertia that in truth belong only to acquired customs." [17] And going still further, Professor Hocking states that "To any one who asserts as a dogma that 'human nature never changes,' it is fair to reply, 'It is human nature to change itself.' " [18]

Human nature can be changed. Further and further away from the idea of immutable instincts grows psychology; if behaviorism errs in wiping instinct altogether away, the trend of other schools is uniformly in the same direction even if they do not go so far. In biology, environmental factors receive increasing emphasis, even the older, orthodox eugenics having acquired in recent years an attitude of sullen resignation. A breezy publicist issues a book addressed to the human race, impertinently declaring, of human nature, *You Can Change It (Though You Won't)*.[19] Another, suggesting how humans are subject to change by the pressure of circumstances even writes about *Man the Puppet*.[20]

Not all at once can we change it; we need have no illusions on that point either. It was a bold, but somewhat unanchored speech made in 1826 by Don Manuel Lorenzo Vidaurre, Minister from Peru to the Pan American Congress at Panama, in which he said, soaringly (the italics are his):

> Human passions will always operate and can never be extinguished; nor, indeed, should we wish to stifle them. Man is always aspiring, and never content with present possessions; he has always been iniquitous, and can we at once inspire him with a love of justice? *I trust we can.*[21]

No; not at once. Only by painfully slow degrees, and not, perhaps, in time to prevent the next war or the next half hun-

dred. Those wars, however, are not inevitable. They are not inevitable simply because war can be eliminated without changing human nature much, if any. Human nature, as Montaigne long ago concluded, consists of so general and constant a variety that any individual and even the entire kingdom he might chance to live in could seem only as a pin's point in comparison.

As a matter of concrete experience it is no easy thing in these days to whip up a population to a state of war. The people have to be lied to, and lied to so persistently that huge machinery must be put into operation; machinery of censorship and suppression on the one hand and of lying propaganda on the other. And finally, relentless conscription must be resorted to in order to bring out the necessary troops and regiment the human war-units behind the lines. Observation does not support what Noah Worcester called "the unfounded and bewildering opinion that wars are inevitable from the nature of man."

Even during the Revolution many men of fighting age had to be dragooned by force and more by short enlistment policies. In Maine, for example, when Colonel Jonathan Mitchell was preparing for his Expedition of 1779 (so it was brought out by a subsequent investigation), Adjutant General Jeremiah Hill reported that

> the troops were collected with the greatest reluctance so that I commanded martial law. Some were taken and brought by force, some were frightened and joined voluntarily, and some skulked and kept themselves concealed.

General Thompson had chortled:

> If they will not go, I will make the country too hot for them.

While Brigade Major William Todd narrated how he marched to Casco Bay, July 14, with one hundred and thirty York County men, "several of which were brought with force of arms." [22]

Says Professor Van Tyne, in his book on *England and America:*

. . . in a country containing something like 700,000 men of fighting age, there was never, even on paper, over one-eighth their number in state militia and Continental army together, and Washington was never able to gather for any one battle over 20,000 men.

In England, according to the same writer:

So great was the dislike of serving abroad, the horror of the brutal practices in the army, and the aversion to the war on America, that not twenty thousand soldiers of the English breed were available in 1776, and recourse was had to mercenary soldiers from petty German states.

In securing the soldiers of British nativity every device was tried between 1775 and 1781. Having exhausted the expedient of voluntary enlistment with the lure of bounties, North did not scruple to offer pardon to malefactors on condition of joining the army. From that his ministry resorted to impressment and inducing justices of the peace to give over to the recruiting officers idle or indigent men.

In the War of 1812, it was no easier to sweep up all the available lads from the farms into the military hopper grinding out its cannon-fodder. The War with Mexico, our vilest conflict, brought forward more volunteers than could be used, but even then largely because of the brief enlistments permitted. Though volunteers were numerous in the Civil War, they were utterly inadequate for the task, and conscription was employed on a considerable scale.

Desertion during the Civil War, a most reliable book by Professor Ella Lonn, published in 1928 by the Century company, gives some startling figures about the hold which the war cause had on the rank and file of the troops (see Chapter XV, below, on "The Fight for War"). "Buried," she states, "in the *Official War Records* lies a perfect mine of evidence of an overwhelming amount of desertion in the Confederacy, revealing the important part this factor played in the ultimate failure of the South to achieve independence. Appalling in the Southern armies, it was even worse in the Northern regiments. . . . The reader will learn that there can be no cause so just or beloved that war in its behalf will not be attended by desertion

among its defenders when a conflict waged on so high a plane as was the Civil War could not be free from it."

The War with Spain was less a war than a preliminary skirmish of imperialism with a great deal of *opéra bouffé* about it: as General Funston called it, "a sharp and short little war, with its sequel in the form of a more protracted and far bloodier struggle in the Philippine Islands." [23] The Philippine campaign was waged principally by regular army troops.

In the World War, from the severance of diplomatic relations with Germany up to the start of the draft, enlistments were astonishingly few in view of the strenuous efforts exerted by the President, the army, and organizations of zealous war patriots. During February the army took in only 4852 recruits; even Recruiting Week, boomed by Mr. Wilson's persuasive eloquence, netted only 9043, though it was everywhere realized that enlistment brought certain privileges of choice hardly to be expected under the impersonal distribution of tasks rosily but unsuccessfully heralded as selective "service." Mr. John Kenneth Turner, who gives these figures, points out that the entire period from the first of April to the first of July, 1917, produced only 133,992 enlistments even under an appeal of special privilege, honor, and social prestige.[24] Says he, "The impulse for America's war certainly did not come from the common people."

The case is very strong, though not so strong as this. The War Department's figures, which I consider authoritative and trustworthy on this point, give for army enlistments for April, May and June 301,693; furthermore there is no reason to confine ourselves to army figures. For army, navy and marine corps the grand total for those revealing three months comes only up to 410,750. At that rate it would have required nearly thirty-three months to raise the 4,412,553 men who were inducted by November 11, 1918. But even that rate was entirely artificial. Says the *Second Report of the Provost Marshal General* (1919):

. . . the selective draft, at certain stages, stimulated voluntary enlistment. . . . Enlistments ran high in April, May, and June, 1917, and then gradually but emphatically dropped to 25 per cent of the highest figure, in the Navy in July and in the Army in September. In the Army this change was apparently influenced by the announcement of the order numbers of the draft in late July; for thereafter the certainty, implied by high order numbers, of not being liable to early call in the draft, removed for many persons the motive to enlist. . . .

In short, the selective draft, in the varying stages of its indirect compulsory influence, was an effective stimulant of enlistment. In spite of the general popularity of the selective service system as such, there persisted always—for many, at least—the desire to enter military service (if needs must) by enlistment rather than by draft—that is, to enter voluntarily in appearance at least. Thus, whenever the prospect of the draft call seemed near, enlistments received the benefit of the dilemma thus created. This indirect effect of a selective draft in stimulating enlistment must be reckoned as one of its powerful advantages.

Though the evidence is less overwhelming, when it is all considered, than Mr. Turner's incomplete use of it would indicate, it is full enough to vindicate his ultimate conclusion. The draft was proof positive that in 1917 there existed no overpowering popular desire to fight.

"England, of course," said a military enthusiast in 1916, "did the same thing at the outbreak of the war as we did at the outbreak of the Civil War, viz., call for volunteers. And the thoughtful, generous-souled, and the patriotic answered the call by thousands. But when the Government wanted tens of thousands, and hundreds of thousands, and millions of course such an appeal broke down." [25] Human nature did not seem very warlike! To this ardent conscriptionist it did not seem very noble; yet what becomes of the thesis that human nature rushes governments into warfare?

When war is on and battle is suspended, one of the worst foes of military ardor is that terrible danger to morale, stigmatized as "fraternization." Brotherhood, after all, bites deeper than bullets. Soldiers at numerous points on both the

Western and Eastern fronts, especially the latter which had suffered most heavily early in the war, had to be shifted about. Germany had to ship troops, on occasion, all the way from one front to the other, because they had grown altogether too kindly disposed to their enemies—with whom, of course, they had more in common than with their own commanders.

Well might the military leaders fear that spirit which occasionally flared up in secret as revealed by Stephen Graham, who tells of finding on a pillar the bayonet scratches of a lone sentry, which read, forebodingly:

> Roll on the Duration
> Roll on Peace
> Roll on the Revolution.[28]

If human nature has changed enough to account for the tremendous social transformations of the past, we need not be too pessimistic over war. If it has not been modified and never can be modified, still those social changes cannot be effaced from the record.

The constructive elements in human nature have conquered over the destructive elements sufficiently for society in general to rid itself of such "habits" as marriage by capture, human religious sacrifice, infanticide, chattel slavery, the duel, prolonged religious wars. Blunder though it may, the race moves on to the new customs and institutions essential to survival. It may not move away from war; but that it *can* so move, what student of societal evolution ventures to doubt?

CHAPTER IX

THE BATTLEGROUND OF ECONOMICS

Consider this, beloved, that on account of private possessions exist lawsuits, enmities, discords, wars among men, riotous dissensions against one another, offences, sins, iniquities, murders. On account of what? On account of what we each possess. Let us therefore, brethren, abstain from the possession of private property or from the love of it if we may not from its possession.
—St. Augustine, Commentary to Psalm cxxxi.

CHAPTER IX

THE BATTLEGROUND OF ECONOMICS

The pioneers in the peace movement did not roll off glib phrases, however meaningful, about world markets, surplus values, imperialism, and the internationalization of raw materials. Modern industrialism had not developed sufficiently, machine production was still too primitive, to start the great movement of modern imperialistic penetration that from 1875 to 1914 was to partition Africa, turn Asia into a hunting ground for European invaders, and bring South America to the verge of an aggressive United States hegemony. Imperialism there had been, indeed, since the gold quests of the ancient Pharaohs; but when imperialism had behind it the roar of machine production, it was driven forth as if that roar came from a mighty cataract of capital pouring from the centers of industrialism over the rest of the planet.

It was not until 1867 that Karl Marx outlined the future course of industrialism as he saw it, in *Das Kapital.*

In new America, neither Dodge nor Worcester could have foreseen such a social pattern. They were eager, however, for light on the causes of war, Worcester in particular, for he had never succumbed to the orthodox simplicity of the "human nature" preoccupation. He and Channing and a group of others in the Massachusetts Peace Society determined to find some factual basis for their pacific operations. Accordingly a committee of highly competent investigators was entrusted with the complex task of finding the causes of past wars. Competent, that is, according to the rather naïve standards of social investigation in their period, but not wholly trustworthy to-day. Yet their summary has much value even now.

A formidable mission! Yet one's admiration is awakened by the workmanlike manner in which they conducted the inquiry

and rendered their report. No trace of any similar investigation since that time have I been able to discover.

The fact that this study seems practically unknown, and the absence of any thorough modern investigation to supplement it and make necessary revisions, is one of the reasons, possibly, why the air is filled with a multitude of prophecies, each stoutly voicing the one and only cause of war.

Examined in the light of existing economic conditions, this astonishingly detailed study reveals a strong cognizance of economic factors, though again the terminology is not that of the modern.

The committee's report was rendered in 1820. It was confined to "wars in which civilized nations have been engaged since they became Christian," or "since Constantine assumed the reins of the Roman Empire," omitting "a great number of petty wars in small nations of antiquity—temporary insurrections or trivial hostilities—and a multitude of wars which have been carried on between Christian and savage nations, such as the aborigines of Asia and America." The report relates to "286 wars of magnitude, in which Christian nations have been engaged." These wars were classified under ten heads. The summary is given in Appendix II.

Briefly tabulated, the conclusions of the committee were reported as follows:

Cause	*Number*
Plunder or tribute	22
Extension of territory	44
Retaliation or revenge	24
Disputed boundaries	6
Points of honor or prerogative	8
Protection or extension of commerce	5
Civil wars	55
Contested titles to crowns	41
Pretense of assisting allies	55
Jealousy of rival greatness	23
Religious wars	28
Defense	0
	286

Any such classification, of course, must of necessity be limited in value, for few wars have a sole and simple cause. Clearly, however, the motives here are chiefly economic. Even though civil wars have sometimes had no economic motive, the preponderance of revolutions is significant; let it be noted by those whose approach to war leaves class struggle entirely out of consideration.

The economic roots of war were perceived rather generally by the early spokesmen of peace, and were discussed in the moral terms of selfishness and possession—not far from the emphasis that St. Augustine fell into for a time. "Philadelphus," the Reverend Samuel Whelpley, wrote in 1818 in connection with war:

> The intense ardour with which many professing Christians pursue wealth, the luxurious purpose for which they employ one part of it, and the adamantine gripe with which they hold the other, and the desperate means they will take to defend even what is superfluous, are contrary to the laws of Christ, and I fear that they are Christians only in name.[1]

Acting on the fallacious assumption that mere increase of human contacts promotes peace, there were those who saw the end of war as a result of growing commerce. Colonel Lindbergh's hope of peace from airplane communication is only a modernized version of the peace optimism engendered by the invention of the steamboat. Tyler Bigelow, at the Massachusetts Peace Society's eighth anniversary celebration in 1824, prophesied that

> The interests of science and of commerce have become so identified with social order, and the peace of the world so much the common property of all nations, that no single nation dares compromit them, without attempting to conciliate, in form at least, the opinion of the world. . . . Commerce, agriculture, and manufactures, considered as the great and leading interests of the many, are the growth of modern times. They are essentially the friends of peace.[2]

John Stuart Mill in 1848 wrote of international trade as "the principal guarantee of the peace of the world," and in words

the like of which we have been hearing often in recent years, "It is commerce which is rendering war obsolete. . . ."

Not by the early nineteenth century, however, had the great nations outgrown the views stated earlier by John Evelyn in England. All of them in varying degree shared in practice his blunt belief that

> A spirit of commerce, and strength at sea to protect it, are the most certain marks of the greatness of Empire. . . . Whoever commands the ocean, commands the trade of the world, and whoever commands that, commands the world itself.[3]

John Jay, in his *Miscellaneous Correspondence,* had also written down a rather different impression gained from first-hand experience when on his mission of peace to England in 1794. France and England were then at war, and the common people of Britain, as of France, would gladly have welcomed a settlement. At a dinner of two hundred British merchants, interested in the promotion of American trade, Jay offered upon request a toast, and one he considered tactful and neutral: *to a safe and honorable peace to all the belligerent powers.* "You cannot conceive," he says in his correspondence, "how coldly it was received, and though civility induced them to give it three cheers, yet they were so faint and single, as most decidedly to show that peace was not the thing they wished. *They were merchants.*" [4]

Yet John Jay's son, "Judge William," out of a mellow optimism befitting his high social position, stated before the American Peace Society, afterwards, that "various causes have contributed to the existing pacific state of the world," and led off his list with "the extension of commerce and the consequent distribution of private property in foreign lands." [5]

Jonathan Dymond would have agreed with Jay the elder. Said Dymond:

> Wars are often promoted from considerations of interest, as well as from passion. The love of gain adds its influence to our other motives to support them, and without other motives, we know that this love is sufficient to give great obliquity to the moral judgment and to tempt us to many crimes. During a war of ten

years, there will always be many whose income depends on its continuance; and a countless host of commissaries, and purveyors, and agents, and mechanics commend a war because it fills their pockets.[6]

William Ladd did not hesitate to speak boldly on this point:

A great obstacle to the progress of pacific principles is avarice. Many men in this country, and more in Europe, get their living and acquire splendid fortunes by war, while the people, to use the language of Dr. Johnson, "are recompensed for the death of multitudes and the expense of millions, by contemplating the sudden glories of paymasters, agents, and contractors, whose equipages shine like meteors, and whose palaces rise like exhalations." No wonder such men, like the silversmiths of Ephesus, applaud a custom which enriches them, for by this *craft* they have this wealth. But the wonder is that the silly multitude should join them in their *hurras,* for *they,* at last, must pay the cost, which is wrung from the hard hand of labour, and filched from the mouth of poverty, to increase the wealth of the rich and the poverty of the poor.[7]

Do not overlook the fact that these are not the words of a modern World War socialist dissenter, many of whom were mobbed and jailed for saying less with more politeness. This is the language of the Reverend William Ladd, respected churchman, founder of the American Peace Society which said recently it remains true to his ideals, while indulging in all sorts of thrusts at "economic radicals."

There is a certain kinship, if only partial and separated by many decades of economic change, between the outspoken Ladd and the tall old man whose trial for a speech made at Canton, Ohio, in 1918 sent him to Atlanta Penitentiary. During his arraignment the unflinching Debs took the same train of thought as Ladd—of whom he had probably never heard—and carried on it a store of current socialist ideas. "War," he said, "does not come by chance."

War is not the result of accident. There is a definite cause for war, especially a modern war. The war that began in Europe may readily be accounted for. For the last forty years, under this international capitalist system, these various nations of Europe have been preparing for the inevitable. And why? In all these

nations the great industries are owned by a relatively small class. They are operated for the profit of that class. And great abundance is produced by the workers; but their wages will only buy back a small part of their product. What is the result? They have a vast surplus on hand; they have got to export it; they have got to find a foreign market for it. As a result of this these nations are pitted against each other. They are industrial rivals—competitors. They begin to arm themselves to open, to maintain, the market and quickly dispose of their surplus. There is but the one market. All these nations are competitors for it, and sooner or later every war of trade becomes a war of blood.

Debs went to jail. And less than one year later, while still refusing to release him, the President who sent him there was saying, in St. Louis:

> Why, my fellow-citizens, is there any man here, or any woman —let me say, is there any child here—who does not know that the seed of war in the modern world is industrial and commercial rivalry? . . . This war, in its inception, was a commercial and industrial war. It was not a political war.[8]

Military and naval men, as well as socialists, ascribed the War to the same chief cause. A year before its actual beginning Professor H. C. Emery of Yale had expounded to the Army War College the economic basis of modern life which brings on hostilities. Professor R. M. Johnston, of Harvard and the War College, in 1915 stated that "economic ambitions are behind the greatest war in history." Senator Harding, later of the White House on Pennsylvania Avenue and Little Green House on K Street, openly differed with President Wilson's idealistic interpretations of 1918. But the Senator from Ohio did not go to prison. After the War, the late Admiral A. P. Niblack avowed the conviction that "greed is the ultimate cause of nearly all wars through the selfish national policies pursued." [9]

Repeatedly, spokesmen of the army and navy express in public identical opinions. Economists of radical and conservative views substantially coincide on the importance of commercial policies as the taproot of war. The outstanding difference rests simply in the unwillingness of the conservatives to

sacrifice the economic policies for the sake of peace; by conservatives meaning, of course, the commercial groups who are served by the retention of the present industrial and imperialistic policies that are wrapped up in what is called, with a somewhat inexact succinctness, "the capitalist system."

Dignify these economic practices by propaganda regarding "incentives," "prosperity," "the full dinner pail," "the full garage," and blend with them the overwhelming sanctification of nationalism, and you have a war-breeding combination positively guaranteed to keep the world in constant threat of what Sherman (imitating Napoleon who knew vastly more about it) termed inadequately "hell."

A list of thirty-two world industrialists who "by virtue of corporate positions and their tremendous moral influence upon the rank and file of their respective industries, control the disposal of the raw materials without which war cannot be waged," was given out in late 1929 by Edward N. Hurley, wartime Chairman of the Shipping Board, with the suggestion that these men use their combined power to prevent all wars. His suggestion immediately inspires the question of how secure the world really can ever be while its destiny remains in the hands of a small group of industrial magnates.

"Many a man," says Norman Thomas in *The Challenge of War,* "without six feet of earth in which to be buried is swollen with pride because his country 'owns' an empire." The three strands of economic imperialism in present-day terms, as summarized by the same writer, are

(1) desire for investment markets for surplus capital;
(2) need for raw material outside the national boundaries;
(3) demand for new markets for manufactured goods.[10]

Many socialists—and most communists also—do not stop with demonstrating that war has economic roots, and that some wars may be prevented by eliminating the underlying economic causes. They go on to contend that by eradicating the economic causes of war, the whole war system will be overthrown and lasting peace brought to the world. Impatient are

some whose emphasis rests primarily on economic causes, of all who unlike them do not lose sight of psychological factors. Do away with the capitalist system; pull up the economic roots of war, and war is thereby done for.

Perhaps this too is oversimplification. It was not a disciple of Wall Street but a British socialist, Bertrand Russell, who flung some deadly potshots at this theory a little while ago:

> Many socialists contend that modern war is due to capitalism, and would automatically disappear if capitalism were abolished. The first and obvious objection to this theory is that war existed before capitalism. Modern wars are not so entirely remote from ancient wars as to make it certain that their causes are utterly different. Nor do we find that the most capitalistic nations are the most warlike; in fact, America is the least warlike of the great powers, while France, the most warlike, is the least industrial. The little countries of Southeastern Europe are intensely bellicose, but mainly agricultural. Czarist Russia was by no means pacific, though 85 percent of the population were peasants. We find, of course, that capitalism, like every other political force, becomes connected with the forces making for war wherever such forces exist; but it is a wrong analysis to suppose that capitalism generates these forces.[11]

Where does Mr. Russell seek these forces then? In the realm of the emotions!

> Fear, rivalry, love of dominion, and love of excitement are the chief emotions which make the ordinary man not averse from war.

Are we back, after all, at Professor James' "moral equivalent"? Not exactly. But we are up against the fact that causes which sometimes lead to war in certain circumstances do not always eventuate in hostilities when the circumstances are not the same. Since the World War, partly because of exhaustion and partly because governments have not been able to rely with assurance on their populations for war service, numerous occasions for war have passed unseized, although beside them the assassination of an Archduke seems trivial in comparison.

Also we are face to face with another fact so obvious as hardly to need stating. Causes of war revolve with the eternal

wheels of time. Old causes disappear, as feudalism, chivalry, and chattel slavery have vanished from the picture. New causes rise to plague the earth, born out of man's mechanical inventions largely, and fostered by his need of furthering them—as, for a modern instance, the world-wide race for rubber and oil. Nor are war causes always easy to dissociate from war's results. Few great treaties of peace have not contained the materials for wars that may have been postponed for centuries. As Dymond came to see, "what was originally an effect becomes a cause, and what was a cause becomes an effect," until, at length, "it is difficult to detect them in all their ramifications, or to determine those to which it is principally to be referred."

We are up against a third important fact: namely, that men will throw their lives away—their dearest possession—after all other possessions have been sacrificed, for the sake of some driving emotional conception of right or duty or "honor." Whatever be the case with governments, peoples go to war not for gain nor for glory but for what they think is to be justice. "Men will fight," says a student of the "national honor" concept, "not so long as they feel it is profitable, but so long as they feel it is right." [12] Conversely, they will cease to fight, or refuse to take part in war, when they feel it is distinctly wrong —or stupid.

Here come to grips the two chief motives for the fact of war: the economic and the psychological. I see but one conclusion to be drawn. War is grounded in numerous complex causes, the chief of which are probably economic. These causes, however, are not static nor the exclusive property of this present period; were they removed, other causes would soon grow to danger-strength. To eliminate the causes of war, therefore, will not eliminate war itself. If we are to wipe out war, it will have to be through a method which makes it impossible for nations to fight even though the most potent causes of war exert the maximum of pressure.

Numerous projects to render war less likely despite disputes have been discussed in earlier chapters: international organi-

zation, world court, arbitration along with varying machinery for inquiry, negotiation, mediation, and conciliation. Chapter X will survey briefly a newer proposal in the outlawry of war. While every one of these plans and processes may be made extremely useful, alone or working smoothly all together they would not be enough. We have to seek a procedure that will make war as utterly inconceivable the world over as a scourge of yellow fever would be now in the Panama Canal Zone.

There is one cause for war, rooted in custom and until recently never attacked by any vociferous portion of public opinion: the willingness of people to do their government's fighting. Here is one indirect but genuine cause of war, assuredly, which if removed makes war impossible to wage.

Labor and the War on War

"The forces for peace in the United States," writes an outspoken critic, "when compared with the forces in England, are insignificant as to numbers and ineffective as to methods. There can be no controversy regarding this fact. The only point worth discussing is why the situation exists. The time has come for a frank study of the present status of the peace movement in the United States."[13]

Why, however, need there be any difficulty about discerning the reason for England's superior status? The answer is obvious. England has a strong labor movement with which the peace movement is nearly though not quite synonymous. Most of the social idealism in England centers in the British Labor Party. There is no such divorce there, as here, between political and trade union activity. American labor has not only been politically conservative; it has lost ground seriously even in the number of workers organized in unions. And while labor in the United States has promoted Latin American friendship, its views on peace are amazingly backward. Toward the problems of international political organization it has turned consistently a cold, disdainful shoulder.

The American Federation of Labor's officials give their blessings to the Citizens' Military Training Camps. They chum

around with reactionary hundred-per-centers and lend themselves to the government's program of industrial preparedness. Whereas British labor cursed Ramsay MacDonald for his wartime pacifism only to make him Prime Minister six years later, American labor has not yet recovered from the shock of the pacifism of American socialists—the only socialist party among the belligerents not to surrender its principles on demand. And American socialism, even after the communist exodus, is still less pacifist in tactical theory than British socialism. In Britain pacifism is found chiefly in labor groups and secondarily in religious bodies; in this country it resides primarily in the churches and religious groups and is conspicuous for its absence in labor circles. Not only is American labor utterly indifferent to pacifism; it is almost equally unregardful of the more conservative peace movement.

And why? If the peace movement has made little impression on labor, it is partly due to the lack of interest in labor's problems on the part of the peace forces. The two movements run along side by side but at scarcely a single point do they meet. The only effort to aid the cause of labor comes from a small—though steadily increasing—number of people in the radical pacifist societies, and on the part of the pacifist student movement. And it must be frankly confessed, labor has thus far revealed no growing interest in pacifism.

Most of the radicalism, the alertness to new social ideas in general, has been confined to unions preponderantly Jewish in make-up, for example the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. On the other hand, the only peace groups which have manifested any keen interest in the labor cause have based their pacifism on the ethical teachings of Jesus—for instance, the Fellowship of Reconciliation and Christian undergraduates. Thus no general *rapprochement* has been possible as in England, whose No More War Movement takes in thousands of workers irrespective of religious or anti-religious predilections.

From the left of labor to the right, and the "right" of the peace movement to the pacifist "left," there is no common ground. Labor's leadership is working-class, but inclined to

ignore the values of organized peace effort; the peace movement is "high-hat" or upper middle-class when not positively blue-blooded, caring apparently little about the great labor struggle and, when caring, frustrate from its own internal sectarianism. Religious peace groups make few or no attempts to enlist labor in the peace enterprise, concentrating almost entirely on the ministry and the churches; the military forces pay labor assiduous attention. Given such conditions, what else could sanely be expected?

Though interested, as we have discovered, in the economic causes of war, in the relation of greed and private possession to national ambition, the peace movement has never felt the justice of labor's struggle enough to share it. The peace groups have never been able to understand that economic injustice and oppression within a nation prevent any true world peace fully as effectively as any international tyrant striding over the backs of prostrate countries.

It must not be forgotten that the score of years from 1820 to 1840, which was a stressful and important period for the early peace pioneers, was also, as Professor John R. Commons has called it, "the awakening period of the American labor movement." Unions had been formed, as for example those of the New York printers, as early as 1786; but, says Professor E. L. Bogart, "the real labor movement did not begin until 1827, when the Mechanics' Union of Trade Associations was organized in Philadelphia." [14]

Instead of being merely ameliorist in character the early trade union movement was often militantly reformist, calling again and again, as one of its spokesmen put it, for "gradual but fundamental changes in the *whole organization of society.*" [15]

When the Massachusetts Peace Society was stirred to jubilant enthusiasm over the receipt of a letter from Russia's Tsar, Lowell mill girls were working an average of ten hours and ten minutes a day, and many of them twelve hours and a half, with 30 and 45 minutes allowed for breakfast and dinner respectively.

The Windham County (Connecticut) Peace Society grew laudatory over the introduction of organized charity, but exhibited no interest in the efforts of workingmen for better conditions. In its report of 1832 it hailed approvingly the charity organizations because they would "lead the rich to feel a deeper interest in the welfare of the poor, and cause the poor to rejoice in the abundance of the rich," suggesting vaguely the good old hymn of Dr. Watts:

> Though I am but poor and mean,
> I will move the rich to love me,
> If I'm modest, neat and clean,
> And submit when they reprove me.[16]

Garrison, in his declining years, declared that "we must more and more look into the causes of war, and do all that in us lies to remove them, or our abstract peace testimonies will amount to little or nothing," [17] yet he could not be persuaded, though numerous attempts were made by his friends, to show regard for the organized labor movement or to modify, by co-operative sharing, the tactics in it to which he took exception. Toward the relation of economic justice to world peace he maintained a persistent blind spot. With extreme illogic, he seemed to consider the ballot, which he thought it wrong to use, an all-sufficient remedy for labor's ills.[18]

The benevolent and elderly Whittier, rightly concerned about slavery in all parts of the world and moved by the steps taken to wipe out the slave trade in Africa by the British General, "Chinese" Gordon, wrote a letter filled with extravagant praise, entirely overlooking the imperialistic butchery to which the famed fighter had given himself. A realistic leader of the American peace movement was stirred to remind those likely to be influenced through the Whittier communication, that "Gordon, sent out on a pacific mission, forgetting his duty began to call the Arabs 'rebels,' and to send accounts of the number he had slain. March 23, he reported three hundred and fifty killed and wounded; June 30, two hundred rebels killed. Yielding to his military instincts he was writing to Sir Evelyn Bar-

ing to deplore that with his 'lovely Krupp guns' he could do so little execution on the natives, for though firing into masses of them, he had succeeded only in killing forty men and wounding sixteen."[19] A parallel might be found in some of the latter-day saints among the Quakers, a few of whom approved our war of 1927 in Nicaragua and who consistently refuse to heed the moral challenge of modern economic issues.

No application to our own class problems was thought of by the peace movement of the 'thirties, in which great interest was aroused by Lafayette's remarks on the future of peace in Europe:

> As on this side of the Atlantic aristocracy and despotism are in incessant war with the rights of nations and of men, I do not see how a peace making system may be obtained until that fundamental warfare is put to an end—then indeed good sense and self-interest will suffice to remove the chances of war.[20]

Of course, the heady young Republic, determined to cash in on its vast resources, had no deep fear by then of aristocracy here, in the strict sense of the term. And yet, it was of these early times that the *Illinois Miner* recently asserted, with pardonable force:

> They worked us eighteen hours in their slimy burrows. They killed us by the thousands beneath their rotten tops. They blew us skyward from the muzzles of their grassy shafts. They paid for sweat and blood and broken bones with wormy beans and rancid fat. They forced us to go begging crusts of bread from brothers as poor as we, displaying stumps and blinded eyes as our right to beg. They kept us in their stinking camps behind barbed wire and stockades like prisoners of war—like convicts doing time. And scarcely had the last clod hit our coffins when they drove our loved ones from their company shacks—to scrub and wash, to beg or steal, or starve or rot. And then we met in the dark of the night, in culverts, caves, and deserted shafts, to find a way from woe and want, from slavery and misery. Thus the union was born. How we struggled, how we fought and bled for that puny union babe! Oh, the tears we wept and the blood we spilled and the lives we paid to raise that precious child! We, too, had our Valley Forge, where we slept on frozen ground, with shivering limbs and empty guts. We, too, left the tracks of bleeding feet in the snow of many a camp.[21]

Charles Sumner, in his address on *The Duel Between France and Germany,* cites with satisfaction some radical European working-class declarations against the Franco-Prussian War. The General Council of the International Working Men's Association on the War stated in London their conviction that "whatever turn the impending horrid war may take, the alliance of the working classes of all countries will ultimately kill war." The Paris Branch of the Association even ventured to send out an appeal, "Brothers of Germany! . . . our division would only bring about the complete triumph of despotism on both sides of the Rhine." At Chemnitz a gathering of delegates representing fifty thousand workers of Saxony replied: "We are happy to grasp the fraternal hand stretched out to us by the workingmen of France." A working-class body in England asserted that "without us war must cease. . . ."

Elihu Burritt, as we shall find, worked directly to build up among labor bodies a strong will against war, and in England at least was conspicuously successful.

Yet so far as the United States is concerned, generally speaking, the anti-war voices of labor have been raised to sing of peace as soloists; for the peace movement has rarely chimed in with them to make the performance a duet.

Time after time the peace movement, in a wholly praiseworthy effort to prevent conflict, has found itself embarrassingly wrecked on a dilemma which, natural history to the contrary notwithstanding, possesses three definite horns. There are times when harmony may be purchased by a compromise between two sides of a conflict, leaving one party impaled on the sharp point of injustice.

Through their zeal for arbitration, for example, the peace societies in the 'eighties all but canonized Secretary of State William M. Evarts for his arbitration pledges, though beyond a hearty handshake at Washington these amounted to little. They were still lauding him as an example of a pacific statesman years after he had announced a certain foreign policy of great historic significance, seen with more and more clarity nowadays to be a breeder of that injustice which leads all too

frequently to war. That policy, aimed at Mexico for an example, gave an official precedent for all our subsequent acts of armed imperialist intervention. It ran as follows:

The first duty of a government is to protect life and property. For this, governments are instituted, and governments neglecting or failing to perform it are worse than useless. Protection *in fact* to American lives and property is the sole point upon which the United States is tenacious. So far, the authorities of Mexico, military and civil, in the vicinity of the border appear not only to take no step effectively to check the raids or punish the raiders, but demur and object to steps taken by the United States. The pretense that the United States are plotting or executing invasions for conquests in Mexico is fallacious and absurd. No American force ever goes over the Rio Grande except in pursuit of "invaders" who have already "invaded" the soil of the United States and are escaping with their booty. The United States have not sought the unpleasant duty forced upon them, of pursuing offenders who, under ordinary usages of municipal and international law ought to be pursued and arrested or punished by Mexico. Whenever Mexico will assume and efficiently exercise that responsibility, the United States will be glad to be relieved from it.

And this, oh ye peace workers unstirred by economics, was offered by Mr. Calvin Coolidge as the chart of our sacred duty when we nearly made war on Mexico, and did intervene in Nicaragua in the brave year, 1927!

Though as far as any awareness of the labor movement is concerned, the American Peace Society after the Civil War might just as well have operated on the Blessed Isles of Greek fancy, the Universal Peace Union early in its career saw that if peace was worth while in the dealings of nations, it was desirable in the realm of industry. Arbitration everywhere was its hobby, and Alfred H. Love, its prime motive power, served as an arbitrator in a number of industrial disputes, with almost uniform success and satisfaction to all parties. The U.P.U., for example, settled a dispute in 1880 between the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and the Reading Railroad Company.

However, judging by present labor standards, the neutrality

of the Union was of questionable service to true justice. If justice cannot be obtained by such instrumentalities of adjustment, the waste of strikes is sure to follow, and after the repeated failure of the strike, violent revolt, in the long run, almost inevitably. The specific arbitral program of the Union called for the maintenance of the open shop, regarded by labor, whether camouflaged as the "American Plan" or not, as a foe to organization, and by labor students as the foe of a responsible unionism. In the great steel strike of 1901 the appeal of the U.P.U. was on behalf of harmony and settlement, and the claims of the striking workers—now seen to have been comparatively conservative—were given scant consideration. The same thing was true during the coal strike of 1902.

Nor was there in evidence, at first, any vision beyond the profit motive. "We must especially represent and appeal to those who are aggrieved and disposed to strike," said the peace society, "to remember that they may some time become employers." [22] On the wage scale permitted there appears to have been a rather slender chance of such a consummation! And how shortsighted was such an emphasis is plain now, when it is the despair of discriminating humanitarians that labor, in this country no less than capital, refuses to work toward social control and production for use rather than for profit.

From its contact with actual labor questions, however narrowly motivated, the U.P.U. was awakening to a new interest in economic issues as a whole. More than the peace societies of to-day, for the most part, it examined open-mindedly even so militant a phenomenon as Debsian socialism. In the late 'nineties and early nineteen-hundreds, socialism was finding its way into the staid pages of *The Peacemaker*. Debates were staged over the contribution of socialism to social peace. Said Alfred Love:

> Don't you do us an injustice after all these years of radical and earnest action, through opposition and persecution? Don't you see we not only assume but assert the equal rights of employer and employed?

To which his opponent, Dr. H. A. Gibbs, responded in hopeless resignation:

> Nowhere do I find any intimation but that the strife [industrial strife, of course] must go on interminably, and the most we can do is to act as a buffer between the contending parties.[23]

Officials of the U.P.U., however, ventured now and again to enter socialist meetings, eager to understand the implications of the movement. Mrs. Mary A. Livermore, famous as abolitionist, suffragist (and as a means of leading Northern women to accept the Civil War), wrote to *The Peacemaker* in her eightieth year to say:

> . . . to me socialism . . . is only "applied Christianity," and will prove as fundamental in the work and business and social affairs of life, when fully tried, as the law of gravitation in the physical world.[24]

And to-day? Between the bulk of the peace and labor-socialist movements—exactly opposite to the situation abroad—stands an abyss that few dare try to span.

What is the reason? Why do so many in the organized peace movement hasten, when pressed, to disclaim any connection with socialism or even to breathe the word; that so many who in their hearts honestly believe in the soundness of its major tenets avoid it as they would the plague? Is it because socialism has grown appreciably less pacific? It cannot be, for the left-wing split took away the prophets of violent revolution. No, the reason, in my opinion, is precisely because the movement in the United States *did* stand true, officially, to its professed internationalism in the test of 1917.

Also, of course, because any effort to reorganize the economic basis of our society brings contest, brings insistence on justice, brings endless struggle; and struggle is the one thing that the dilettante peace movement of the United States abhors with all its soul. The struggle for a better economic order, a society based on a true industrial democracy, even though waged only by ballot, personal sacrifice, and public demonstration, means heavy casualties to entrenched respectability. And

until the recent opposition of the superpatriotic Paul Reveres, no movement in our history had ever become more excessively respectable.

It is symptomatic of our condition that a person may be an "absolutist" conscientious objector and receive scarcely more punishment in war than the same objector in time of "peace" is likely to experience if he asserts an equally devoted interest in the struggle to emancipate the toiling masses.

And so while war will not pass away when its economic causes are uprooted, the alliance of the peace forces and the labor movement—a movement probably destined to preëmpt the social history of the twentieth century—cannot with wisdom be delayed. It is the workers who will be the raw material out of which the rebellion against war must come; it is they who have the most to gain from war's eradication. If labor cannot be placed in back of the push for a warless world, the peace movement may as well give up at once. For a hundred years it has practically ignored labor and the working millions. Toward the abolition of war it has made slight progress if any. There are many reasons for that failure, but surely this is one.

CHAPTER X

WAR AS AN OUTLAW

There are some who say, "We are skillful at marshalling troops; we are skillful at conducting battles." They are great criminals.
—MENCIUS (died about 289 B.C.), in *Tsin Sin.*

CHAPTER X

WAR AS AN OUTLAW

The period which witnessed the birth and early growth of the peace movement was strongly dominated by moralistic criteria. If a practice was considered to be morally defective, it was speedily labeled "unlawful." By "unlawful" or "criminal" was meant something which was unsanctioned, not by the legal but by the moral code.

So it was with war in the thought of the peacemaking reformists. Hundreds of examples, literally, of such references to war could easily be adduced. The Reverend Benjamin Bell was interested in showing precisely on what occasions "only it is lawful to go to war." [1] All of the more prominent leaders commonly referred to war as "unlawful" or as "a crime." The Reverend Howard Malcolm, President of the American Peace Society from 1861 to 1878, once published a pamphlet on *The Criminality of War.* Yet the old-time poet was right:

> When high are piled
> Mountains of slain, the large enormous guilt,
> Safe in its size, too vast for laws to whip,
> Trembles before no bar.[2]

Noah Worcester, as exponents of the modern movement for the Outlawry of War will recognize, had caught in 1819 at least a glimmering of the ideas actuating Mr. Salmon O. Levinson to launch his Outlawry project in 1918. Public opinion, Worcester said, would be enough when enlightened to compel the decrees of a High Tribunal under whose jurisdiction should come the complex problems of international relations. Just as duelling had been brought to a defensive place by public opinion, so would war come to occupy the same position on the

moral defensive. A High Tribunal could as successfully enforce its decrees internationally as had the Supreme Court in the United States. The Founder of the Massachusetts Peace Society further said:

> In many instances a change in public sentiment has paralyzed an absurd or inhuman law, years before it was repealed by legislators. When public opinion changes in regard to the necessity of a sanguinary law, it first becomes difficult and afterwards impossible, to carry the law into execution. . . . As a change in public sentiment can thus enervate an absurd or cruel law, so it can enforce one which is humane and wise; and as it can enforce humane laws, so can it give effect to humane compacts and decisions. Therefore, should such a Tribunal as has often been proposed be organized by a compact between the rulers of different nations, it will stand in no need of armies to enforce its decrees. An enlightened public sentiment in its favor will be infinitely preferable to all the military and naval establishments in the universe.[3]

Feeling his way along the same dim corridor, Andrew Preston Peabody in 1843 allowed an unwonted note of hard realism to creep into his speaking:

> So long as war is deemed lawful, its deeds and heroes will be painted in attractive colors, and held forth for the admiration and praise of mankind,—its anniversaries will be a nation's gala-days,—its glories will crowd the page of history, inspire the tragic muse, and float on the breath of song. . . .
>
> The evils of war, that are usually spoken of, are such as occur only in a state of actual warfare; and it is, perhaps, not an uncommon idea, that, were permanent peace cemented among the leading powers of Christendom, in whatever way such a result was brought about, the friends of peace would have nothing left to demand or desire. I think very differently. Were actual warfare suspended, from motives of policy, for any indefinitely long period, yet, were the lawfulness of war still recognized, were the associations of glory connected with martial progress left untouched, war, in a spiritual aspect, would be hardly less a curse upon mankind than it is during a time of actual warfare. In the Peace Reform, as in all religious reformations, a merely outward change is of little avail.[4]

He was thinking primarily, as the context makes clear, of the need of organizing the moral sentiment in the Christian

world for the utter repudiation of war. Referring to a change in the policy of the American Peace Society in 1837 to a radical pacifist basis, he says:

> It is for these reasons that our Society has of late years dismissed its old argument for peace on the ground of expediency and policy, has based the cause of peace on Christian grounds and has aimed chiefly to produce a state of sentiment conscientiously opposed to war under any and all circumstances.

As was natural, he therefore passed over the legalistic undercutting that his logic had led him up to, and went straight on to an even deeper-lying factor in the fight for peace.

Elihu Burritt toyed with the phrase but gave it the "reverse English," writing on "Christianity Outlawed by War." [5]

It was on March 9, 1918, that Mr. Salmon O. Levinson, a Chicago attorney, proposed in *The New Republic* that the nations delegalize war. Later that month, in the same journal, appeared an article of comment by Professor John Dewey. In 1919 Mr. Levinson formulated his idea specifically, in collaboration with Senator Knox, and the issue for December 29, 1921, of *Unity,* edited by John Haynes Holmes, first published the text in full, with comment by numerous early proponents of the scheme. A resolution for Outlawry was introduced in the Senate on February 13, 1923, by Senator William E. Borah of Idaho. From that time to this, discussion of the Outlawry plan has steadily grown in volume. Its most noteworthy advocates have been Senator Borah, the late Senator Philander C. Knox, Professor Dewey, the Reverend John Haynes Holmes, Judge Florence Allen, Colonel Raymond Robins, the Reverend M. V. Oggel, and, conspicuous for his fidelity to the cause and his great aid in giving the project wide publicity, Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison, editor of *The Christian Century.* Dr. Morrison's book *The Outlawry of War,* published in 1927, is the most comprehensive and authoritative statement of the ideas underlying the Outlawry movement.

So much attention has been paid to the Pact of Paris that a false emphasis is easy to give. Whatever its proponents may say in their enthusiasm, the Pact does not signalize the

final achievement of Outlawry; rather, it constitutes the first great stage. Hence it may be well for the sake of clearer perspective to postpone for a moment any consideration of the Pact, and take up briefly the original aims of the movement for Outlawry and its later development.

The proposal to outlaw war, in comparison with the older projects, came as a youngster; its aim was almost revolutionary in its approach to war, but its tactic was a peaceful revolution along legal channels of procedure.

War, it declared, is an institution, and cannot successfully be eradicated by the policy of taking "next steps" for peace within the war system. The war system must be outlawed by the nations. So long as war remains legal, hope for a real peace is only visionary.

The process of outlawing the war system required a fourfold program: (1) the denunciation of war as a crime by international agreement, preferably at a conference of all the powers, large and small; (2) creation and codification of a body of international law; (3) establishment of a world court with affirmative jurisdiction, that is, competent to handle cases upon the appeal of a single nation; (4) enforcement of international law and agreements only by the pressure of public opinion.

The procedure of the original plan is indicated by the draft printed in *Unity* under date of December 29, 1921, as formulated in 1919 by Mr. Levinson and Senator Knox:

> A Conference of all Civilized Nations to be called for the creation and codification of international law; the code to contain, among other things, the following provisions, with which all the other provisions of the code must not be in conflict:
>
> 1. The further use of war as an institution for the settlement of international disputes shall be abolished.
>
> 2. War between nations shall be declared to be a public crime, punishable by the law of nations.
>
> 3. War shall be defined in the code and the right of defense against actual or imminent attack shall be preserved.
>
> 4. All annexations, exactions or seizures, by force, duress or fraud, shall be null and void.
>
> 5. An international court with affirmative jurisdiction over purely international disputes shall be created modelled as nearly

as may be on the jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court over controversies between states. All purely international disputes as defined by the code shall be decided and settled by the international court sitting as a judicial body, which shall be given jurisdiction over all parties to a dispute upon the petition of any party to the dispute or of any signatory nation.

6. All nations shall agree to abide and be bound by and in good faith to carry out the orders, decrees and decisions of such Court.

7. One nation cannot summon another before the International Court except in respect to a matter of international and common concern to the contending nations, and the jurisdiction of the court shall not extend to matters of governmental, domestic or protective policy unless one of the disputing parties has by treaty or otherwise given a country a claim that involves these subjects. The classes of disputes excluded from the jurisdiction of the international court should be specifically enumerated in the code and not be left open to the flexible and dangerous distinction between justiciable and non-justiciable controversies.

8. The court should sit in the hemisphere of the contending nations; and if the disputants live in opposite hemispheres, then in the hemisphere of the defendant nation.

9. National armaments to be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety and with the necessities of international requirements.

10. Abolition of professional soldiery and the substitution of a potential army through citizen soldiery on the Swiss model.

11. All nations shall make public report once each year setting forth fully their military and naval armaments, structural and chemical. These reports to be verified by authorized committees.

12. The doctrines of military necessity, retaliation and reprisal which are open to such flagrant and abhorrent abuse, shall be eliminated.

The Levinson-Knox-Borah plan suffered not a little from the confused use of the term "outlawry" which followed upon a seizure of the word by agencies with other schemes to float. The phrase, of course, was not copyrighted or trade-marked, and strictly speaking could be applied to other methods. Since, however, a definitely organized American Committee for the Outlawry of War had been functioning in Chicago under Mr. Levinson's leadership and since the idea emanated from him, it seems not only fair but wise for the sake of clarity to let the term re-

main attached to this specific project. In any case, the brilliant strides ahead made by the idea in a remarkably brief period, appear to have settled this point beyond dispute.

What are the special advantages to world peace in the Outlawry proposal and its rapid development?

First, it is free from the responsibility for maintaining the World War settlements. In this its advantage over the League of Nations is tremendous. The League's roots are still caught in the World War, the iniquitous Treaty of Versailles, and a complex of arbitrary territorial adjustments—such for example as the exploitation of mandated areas, the creation of buffer states along the Russian border, the separation of East Prussia, and the ever-troublous question of national minorities.

The court and law visioned by the Outlawry movement would be comparatively free from such commitments—though less free perhaps, nations still being what they are, than some outlawrists have recognized. As far back as 1889, Edward Everett Hale preached a sermon in Washington on "The Twentieth Century," uttering a prophecy which shows how far we are from the real aims of the world court movement of pre-war vintage:

> The twentieth century will apply the word of the Prince of Peace to international life. The wisdom of statesmen will devise the solution, which soldiers and people will accept with thankfulness. The beginning will not be made at the end of a war, but in some time of peace.

A reordering of international law uncompromised by the emotional states and economic disturbance of war conditions would be, indisputably, a more pacific instrumentality.

Second, Outlawry does not contemplate the joint use of force as a sanction. Not merely because force engenders force, not only because force, even though reserved ostensibly for violators of international agreements, has its inevitable corollary in fear instead of real security; but also because force sanctions are almost invariably to be found in defense of "law and order," that is, the *status quo,* and against just and neces-

sary social change—for this reason in particular. Outlawry's repudiation of military sanctions has an important advantage over previous ideas of international law enforcement. In this respect Outlawry is in accord with the far-sighted William Ladd; and it stands as a constant challenge to the older European concept of sanctions.

Third, Outlawry seeks to undercut the prevalent idea of war as a last resort. If delay fails; if conciliation, arbitration, diplomatic compromise leave issues unsettled and contention unreconciled, war is still as criminal as ever. While injustice may be done in some such cases, Outlawry says boldly that war is no remedy, not even in extreme cases, but is itself the worst injustice in the world. It anticipates the settlement of controversies up to the *n*th power without a punitive war on an offending nation.

And fourth, Outlawry reverses the traditional relations of warmakers and peacemakers by giving the pacific elements of the world recognition as law-abiding citizens while stigmatizing the jingoes and patrioteers as outlaws, guilty not only of indiscretion but of illegality. A conscientious objector, were Outlawry an established fact, would have behind him the force of law and, ultimately, public sentiment; while otherwise, he must suffer the handicap of an obstructionist status. Given Outlawry, the tables are turned: colleges, churches and other respectable institutions would not have to summon all their courage and tolerantly permit the presence of peace speakers while welcoming perforce the brass-buttoned dignitaries of slaughter; instead they would have to be persuaded—oh, sweet vision of Topsy-turvyland!—by tolerant pacifists to hear the well-meaning but, of course, misguided General Stalwart decry the passing of the good old days when men were men.

Let not your awakening, however, be too long delayed! Unfortunately the Outlawry plan, despite its magnificent promise, contains some points of danger.

For one thing, it puts too much reliance on the force of law. Outlawry is an American plan; and Americans characteristically fail to distinguish between legislation and social accom-

plishment. As Felix Frankfurter and James M. Landis put it in *The Business of the Supreme Court:*

> To an extraordinary degree legal thinking dominates the United States. Every act of government, every law passed by Congress, every treaty ratified by the Senate, every executive order issued by the President is tested by legal considerations and may be subjected to the hazards of litigation. Other nations, too, have a written Constitution. But no other country in the world leaves to the judiciary the powers which it exercises over us.

Naturally enough, the idea of Outlawry lends itself to overemphasis. Spokesmen for Outlawry as, for instance, Senator Borah in his resolution, cite the example of our Supreme Court, which is "a practical and effective model for a real international court, as it has specific jurisdiction to hear and decide controversies between our sovereign states."

So little sovereign have our states become, however, that even the Constitutional right to maintain a genuinely separate militia has been practically abrogated without protest, for State and Federal forces have been dovetailed by the creation of the National Guard, and it has become increasingly common, though not without early protests, for Federal troops to enter a state for police purposes.

During Jackson's administration South Carolina all but seceded from the Union over the tariff favoritism shown to the North; and her spokesmen openly flaunted the power of the Supreme Court. It was Congressional action, coupled by Jackson's retreat, that saved the country from armed rebellion. And saved it for a few years only, for when an issue became joined between the whole South and the North, the Supreme Court was powerless to do a thing to check the drift toward the Civil War.

Another analogy drawn by those who advocate Outlawry is that between war and the duel; both, as they say, specific social institutions. "War," says Dr. Morrison, "is dueling on an international scale"; and further, "The outlawry of the institution of war will have precisely the same effect in international relations as the outlawry of the duel had in individual

relations." Says Mr. Levinson, "Finally, the simple discovery was made that the way to get rid of dueling was to condemn it by law,—to call it by its right name, murder, and thus to outlaw it. Thereupon, dueling as an institution ceased and codes of dueling became museum exhibits."

Prohibition, however necessary, seems often laggard in prohibiting, whatever be the custom outlawed. The analogy between dueling and war breaks down, like most analogies; for in practical working out, it matters infinitely less to the future of the human race whether dueling go on than it does whether outlawed wars break out, for war to-day may actually mean the extinction of our culture.

As a matter of fact, the outlawry of dueling did not stop the practice, though unquestionably in the long period before dueling ceased to be common the point of view of the law exercised an influence on popular opinion. Still, dueling lingered for many years. In Europe it even now is far from totally extinct. As Kirby Page has pointed out:

> In such countries as France, England and Germany dueling continued for nearly three hundred years after it became illegal. In France dueling became a capital crime, punished with death, as early as 1602. Yet within the following decade two thousand nobles were killed in affairs of honor. One authority tells us "that the private duel though much practised during the medieval period of English history, was never legalized, and was denounced and prohibited by a royal edict of James I in 1613 and by a decree of the Star Chamber in 1614." Yet dueling survived in England till the middle of the last century.[6]

In fairness to Outlawry, however, it must be said that one of the chief reasons why dueling continued so long was due to the severity of the punishment which made the law a paper statute only, respected by no one. By the change to a more reasonable code as was suggested by Bentham in 1789, dueling was soon frowned upon; and it is worthy of note that in this respect Outlawry's reliance upon a general disapprobation is considerably more advanced and efficacious than, for instance, the League's authorization of punishment by war.

Nevertheless, it was a gradual relinquishment of the preroga-

tives of outraged "honor" that gave dueling its death blow in most places. According to one of our historians writing of the period 1830-1850, in the United States:

> This product of chivalry had in the preceding generation prevailed in all sections except New England and Pennsylvania, but had been made illegal. The law, however, had little effect upon the practice. It is popularly supposed to have received its death blow when Burr so killed Hamilton. It is possible that this was so but in that case the blow must be considered as having very lingering effects. Twenty years later one of the most advertised of American duels took place between Clay and John Randolph Roanoke—the West against the South. Nor did the duel die out during the lifetime of this generation.[7]

And Clay wrote to his former constituents in Kentucky, of dueling, "Its true corrective shall be found when all shall unite, as all ought to unite, in its unqualified proscription." [8]

The Burr-Hamilton encounter had taken place at the foot of Weehawken cliffs, beside the Hudson, in the sultry early morning of July 11, 1804. A monument to Hamilton was erected on the spot, but so prone to the heroics of the *duello* were brave young bloods afterwards that the memorial had to be removed, since it encouraged others to go and fight out some issue of honor where so distinguished a citizen had fallen. As *The Calumet* explained in 1831:

> Instead of serving as a beacon to warn others away, it would be taken as an excuse or justification for engaging in the same mad conflict—in fact as a sort of lure to duelling.[9]

It was not law that replaced the duel, as stated by Professor William Macdougall:

> The practice of duelling has declined only in proportion as men have been assured of redress for their injuries at the hands of the courts of justice.[10]

A common but a false conception! The questions over which duels were chiefly fought lay not in the realm of legal but of "non-justiciable" concerns, involving redress for insults of all degrees from those of serious political magnitude to the pettiest trivialities of the dance floor, the moonlit aisles of courtship, or the grogshop.

The real manner in which the duel passed away was by the

refusal of men in increasing numbers to sanction or engage in it, no matter what the provocation or how stern the challenge. Washington was challenged but contemptuously declined to participate in what the early peace movement used to classify as "private war." Again and again the daring ones who poohpoohed the sacred claims of "honor" added more to their numbers, until at length an institution even so deeply rooted in centuries of custom was "outlawed" by a public opinion increasingly determined not to heed the call of the personal ordeal-by-combat.

Another early weakness of the Outlawry movement was its insufficient reliance on political action. It is not correct to criticize Outlawry, as numerous League advocates have done, for chronic isolationism; Outlawry, too, takes cognizance of the need for world organization. Nevertheless, throughout the Outlawry movement ran for a time a depreciation of the need for increasing international political union, and an unwarranted trust in juridical processes. Yet some of the gravest challenges to peace issue out of problems entirely political in character. Without a gradual lessening of the significance of artificial boundary lines, without a growth toward *bona fide* political federation, a world court however competent judicially, though a lighthouse to mark the shoals of international relations, will be a beacon built on stilts instead of solid rock.

In one additional respect the Outlawry program has been dangerously confused and weak. This weakness is the tolerance, as a rule not explicit, of defensive war. Uncritical partisans of Outlawry stoutly contend that this is not so, that the right of self-defense is inalienable and can never be taken away by law, and that the right of self-defense and defensive warfare are not at all the same thing. This is a subtle distinction which can exist in theory but never in practical affairs. The source of this distinction appears to be not the founders of the movement for Outlawry themselves, but no less a jurist than John Bassett Moore. Writing in *Unity* for September 4, 1924, Mr. Levinson declares:

In 1920 John Bassett Moore suggested to the writer a change in the wording of the Outlawry plan, saying: "When you once

outlaw war do not use the word 'war' any more. Do not attempt to make a distinction between aggressive and defensive wars. The right of self-defense is inherent and must be preserved, but is not war."

Resorting to the antique analogy between individuals and nations—an analogy responsible for as much muddled thinking as any ever used in world relations—Dr. Moore goes on to say, according to Mr. Levinson:

Self-defense by an individual makes the defender neither a murderer nor a duellist.

What kind of defense has been contemplated by the proponents of Outlawry, who declare that defense is not "defensive" war? Do they propose non-violent resistance, non-cooperation, or any pacifist technique? What they mean is clearly indicated. In comments published together with the original plan, Mr. Levinson stated explicitly that "An international agreement based on the foregoing . . . would preserve the Monroe Doctrine, our tariff and revenue policies, our right to repel invasion. . . ." The plan, as quoted previously, provides for the reduction of national armaments *to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety,* and calls for the *abolition of professional soldiery and the substitution of a potential army.* When Mr. Coolidge toward the end of his term stated that there was no relation between the Pact of Paris and the plan to increase our cruisers, he was giving voice to Yankee cynicism, perhaps, but nevertheless he was not so far afield as some of those whose loyalty to the Outlawry movement has resulted in a self-hypnosis that blinds them to the existence of patent facts.

Dr. Morrison, for example, is forced to the acme of metaphysical subtlety, and asserts that the whole question of self-defense is irrelevant to Outlawry:

If the danger of omitting such clauses from the draft treaty and the resolution consists in the possibility that an ultra pacifist interpretation may be read into the outlawry proposal, the danger of including such clauses consists in the likelihood that some people will not really read what the words say. The words do not say that self-defense is approved; nor do they say that self-defense

is condemned. The words say that self-defense is neither *involved in* nor *affected by* the outlawry of war. Outlawry absolutely has no point of contact with the question of the right of self-defense.[11]

In my opinion, it had better have! Suppose we are to outlaw war in general, but neither condemn nor approve it; it is a monstrously absurd undertaking. Then why the same impossible treatment of defensive war, which, in national practice, unless definitely named and definitely renounced, will be the concrete expression of the evasive "self-defense." If Outlawry cannot forthrightly renounce warfare as a means of defense, it has slender warrant for criticizing the League's tolerance of war against an "aggressor" nation.

In his message to Congress on December 4, 1929, President Hoover gave what must be accepted as an official view of our responsibility through the Treaty. "Under the Kellogg pact," he said, "we have undertaken never to use war as an instrument of national policy. We have, therefore, undertaken by covenant to use these equipments [i. e., our armaments] solely for defensive purposes."

Interestingly enough on the twelfth of December, 1927, Senator Borah reintroduced his resolution with the section allowing defensive war deleted. Officially, at least, one of the chief weaknesses of the project was thus corrected. But the correspondence regarding the Paris Pact has shown quite plainly where the nations stand. In any public discussion the great bulk of its backers may confidently be relied on earnestly to testify that the program is not pacifist and has no relevancy to pacifism.

It has, of course; unless pacifism be considered merely as an individual, purely personal witness against war, intended not as a war preventive but as surcease to one's soul or conscience. Such an interpretation of pacifism is unwarranted. Though some pacifists and conscientious objectors, it is true, have manifested just that kind of individualistic non-conformity, the great bulk of pacifists regard their movement as a challenge to the war system, directed squarely toward the purpose of mobilizing opposition to war—minority opposition to be sure, but by a minority sufficiently numerous and sturdy, so

braced for propaganda and for punishment as to tie the itching hands of Mars.

Such a pacifism—which *is* pacifism to-day—is not only relevant to Outlawry, but at the heart of it. Squirm away as they will, all other movements to abolish war must reckon with it. Pacifism is no panacea; in fact, the pacifist movement is all but unique in recognizing the valid necessity for many complementary approaches to peace. By ignoring it, however, the other movements leave out the policy most central to any genuine abolition—instead of the mitigation, reduction or postponement—of armed conflict.

Regarded as a magnificent first step toward Outlawry the Paris Pact, if lived up to sincerely, would open the way for a peace program impossible before this to achieve. No document of such a character has ever been agreed on in all history. Considering the difficulties in the way, its signing is alone a splendid tribute to the real value of Outlawry, as well as to the energy and devotion of its proponents.

It will now be possible to set up a new code of international responsibility, to penetrate the folk-thinking of peoples with a new conception. So much hangs on the Pact that a clear appreciation of its nature is essential. What it does is apparent in the text (which will be found as Appendix III); it renounces war as an instrument of national policy, and it pledges settlement by pacific means of all disputes of whatever origin or nature.

Could these provisions be taken at face value, everything conceivable in the way of war renunciation would thereby be accomplished. Unfortunately, by a series of notes exchanged prior to the signing of the Pact, it was made clear that certain interpretations are held binding by such powers as France, England and the United States. While not technically reservations, these interpretations are tantamount to the same thing.

The Pact does not renounce all war, but only war "as an instrument of national policy." Exactly what these words mean nobody knows although they are generally understood to refer to unprovoked wars of conquest or aggression. "Defensive" wars allowed by Outlawry are permitted under the

Briand-Kellogg treaty. What has been stated earlier about "defensive" war points straight to the conclusion that the Pact renounces all wars except the wars we are most likely to have.

"War as an instrument of national policy" will be defined not in advance of a test but under the impact of concrete crises. That a final decision does not exist is clear from the efforts made by publicists to explain the term, especially in the writings of its coiner. In his book *War as an Instrument of National Policy and Its Renunciation in the Pact of Paris,* Professor Shotwell brings the matter back finally to the attempt to define an aggressor on the formula of refusal to arbitrate. Though this idea is basically far from adequate, it is at least more practicable than the idea of territorial defense implicit in Outlawry, which Professor Shotwell in an address before the Academy of Political Science thus handled:

> The categories of defense extend beyond the action of the defense of an invaded soil. Especially since the airplane has come, this is absolutely clear to anyone who is familiar with the phenomena of war. The only adequate defense against the airplane, speaking realistically and as the wars of the future would be fought, is to attack the airplane before it leaves the ground. There is no adequate defense for an invaded city or land once the airplane with its heavy bombs is above the point of destination.
>
> That is mere incident, however, for the whole treatment of defense must rest upon another distinction than the place where the war is fought. In parenthesis the claim of Britain to have fought anything like a defensive war in the last war is, of course, in point here, because it fought on the Plain of Flanders and in France. Not *where* a war is fought, but *how* or *under what conditions,* constitutes the category of defense which we shall have to detach from the commitment of this treaty.

But it can hardly be too strongly emphasized that the interpretation of "war as an instrument of national policy" finally rests with the great powers among the nations of the world. Only time will tell what governments mean to do about it. They have tried to tell what it is not; but they have been mute or vague regarding what it is.

Each nation signing the Pact is to decide for itself when it thinks another signatory has broken the Treaty, and although a joint punitive use of force is not authorized, each nation is

free thereafter to take whatever action it desires, military or otherwise. Thus the Pact does not get down to the roots of international anarchy, but leaves the principle of "sovereignty" just about where it is. And sovereignty, the right of a nation to be a law unto itself when it feels such a course essential, is a primary contributor to war.

The Pact does not rescind the force provisions of existing treaties of military defense, treaties that reach across all continental Europe.

The adherence of the United States to the Pact can at any time be repealed by the treaty-making powers—President and Senate. The ratification of the Pact has done nothing appreciable to change the armament situation, anywhere in the world. War resisters, objecting to conscription, are nowhere handled better than before; as H. Runham Brown, Secretary of the War Resisters' International, recently stated, "Tell the peoples of every nation that the solemn renunciation of war through the Pact of Paris has made no difference in the treatment of those who take it seriously and who outlaw war by refusing to prepare for it." The United States still denies citizenship to radical pacifists.

Further, in certain large and important areas of the world the Treaty is held not to apply. Such is the case with places essential to Britain's imperialist strategy, as revealed by the British notes and declarations prior to signing the document. Similarly, our own interventions in Latin America escape denunciation because they are not deemed to be war. Charles Sumner, when upholding our own sovereignty sixty-five years ago, declared in ringing tones, "Armed intervention is war and nothing else." [12] But when it becomes our policy to intervene in the affairs of other states, we do not call it war and thereby expect for it immunity under a document banning wars "of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be."

Chiefly in respect to its failure to authorize punitive war, the Pact is a great advance over the League's mechanics. It will have an increasing influence on the development of the League in this particular.

From the very inception of the Outlawry movement it came

into sharp conflict with the basic assumption of the League of Nations, and in my judgment rightly so. The contrast has not been so much as one hundred per cent in favor, however, of the Outlawry proposal. Born in days when the League's worst features were so painfully obvious as to obscure what good was in it; fathered politically by leaders unfree from the taint of habitual isolationism, Outlawry's reaction against the League process was extremely sharp. Time has wrought changes on both sides and a new note of better mutual comprehension has crept into League and Outlawry circles, and in both groups a note of greater realism.

Clear has it become that unless the League is soon plunged by a war into the limbo of unpleasant memories, it is not going to abdicate, even to suit so potent a gentleman as Uncle Samuel. That the League should deliberately bore a hole in its own hull seems a preposterous notion. The chances are that for the twentieth century, at any rate, it is this League or none.

Looking backward upon the age-long effort to accomplish any kind of semi-comprehensive world *rapprochement,* realizing the immensity of the task, what sane person can hope for the break-up of the League in war? Or even for its gradual ossification? There is no such thing as innocuous desuetude; in any realm of life desuetude is not innocuous but rather filled with potencies of danger. The small nations which suffer under mandated exploitation and groan beneath the imperialism of the great powers cling desperately to the League machinery. Economic radicals, however far to the Left, are encountered by the presence of Russia as an observer in League affairs, using the very process of League discussion for publicity regarding her strictures on the League's controlling policies. Better by far that the League, modified by danger as its good points are, be subjected to attempts at drastic modification before it is given up. So long as it exists, for better or for worse, no fresh effort at comprehensive international organization is conceivable.

Some such considerations as these, perhaps, induced Mr. Borah to publish in the *New York Times* of February 5, 1928, a discussion of the Briand-Kellogg negotiations in the course of

which he said, not that under no circumstances would the United States enter the League, but that (italics mine)

> the United States now stands ready to coöperate and *identify itself with* a system based upon pledges not to wage war.

"It seems to me," declared the Senator also, "as Lord Thompson has said, 'If war were outlawed, the League would be far more firmly founded than it is to-day.' " This comment signified a turning point. A new coöperation with the affairs of the League is increasingly evident on the part of outlawrists; and on the other hand the European diplomats have ceased to sneer at Outlawry. There is no basic conflict between the two which should prevent a developing service to each other.

On the part of American outlawrists, any realistic program toward the League would doubtless include an effort for the inclusion of defensive war in the war to be outlawed (by dropping the "war" clause in the Preamble) and an express willingness to join the League provided specific changes are made in the Covenant and Court looking toward the final consummation of Outlawry. On the part of the League a start toward a really vital peace instrument would be continued by abandonment of the war sanctions; by completing the force of the Optional Clause in the Court, a step toward which tremendous gains have been made; by the recodification of international law on the basis of outlawed war; and, particularly, to avoid the perpetual schism in which so much war danger still lurks, the admission of Soviet Russia (a signer of the Pact) into the League, the only test of that country's fitness being a desire to enter.

Are such developments as these impossible, incredible, fantastic this side of the millennium? To many they will seem just that. And yet it is scarcely unrealistic to suggest action that may not be taken; it is unrealistic to seek the goal of peace through means that are less than adequate.

Both the concept of Outlawry and the concept of world organization are valid and essential. Neither can stand still. Together they must go forward, adjusting themselves to new world needs.

CHAPTER XI

ARGUMENTS OF THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

In hilly New England the settlers discovered that the best way to build a barn is to set the foundation in a hillside, keep the animals in the basement and drive the wagons from the uphill side into the second floor on the level. When their descendants emigrated to the flat prairies of Illinois, they continued to build barns in the only way they knew. Having no hillsides they built the barn first, built a plank hillside running up into the barn and then got stalled trying to haul loads of hay up this hill! . . .

In an early day in the level West the practice struck root of laying out roads on the section lines. Later the gridiron plan was adhered to even in rough country where it would have been more economical to lay out the roads according to the contour, so that they would follow the water courses or the water partings. Today millions of loads are needlessly hauled over hill after hill on their way to market and thousands of hillside roads are washed away every season because men blindly follow precedent.—Edward A. Ross, in *The American Journal of Sociology*, March, 1920.

CHAPTER XI

ARGUMENTS OF THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

THE traditionalism of military minds is axiomatic. That other minds run the same human danger becomes clear as we examine the historic ideology of the peace movement. Along with the major approaches to a warless world a set of typical arguments have been adduced over and over again to win the support of public opinion.

Like a squirrel in his wheel the peace movement for more than a century has run over the same pleas again and again; and like the squirrel it gets nowhere by that route. Not that these ancient arguments are unsound; merely that they are side issues, nothing but skirmishes in the real fight for peace.

There may be profit in examining them, one by one. They have a contribution to make to the ultimate victory; but a view of them in perspective will serve to fix their true relationship to the whole peace struggle.

War's Cost in Life and Treasure

Very much as a man who, fighting drunk, has run amok and slaughtered madly becomes appalled when sober at the swath he has scythed through his innocent victims, so a war-mad world when its spree is over settles down in horror to count the cost.

Said a conservative pro-war newspaper, five years after the World War was over:

> Let us visualize a march of the British dead down Fifth Avenue. At daybreak they start, twenty abreast. Until sundown they march . . . and the next day and the next. For ten days the British

dead pass in review. For eleven days more the French dead file down the "Avenue of the Allies." For the Russians it would require the daylight of five more weeks. Two months and a half would be required for the Allied dead to pass a given point. The enemy dead would require more than six weeks. For four months men actually killed in the war, passing steadily, twenty abreast. . . .[1]

A gruesome motion picture? But that is only one part of the cost of war. Though on a smaller scale, of course—mankind being less skilled and civilized in days gone by!—it has always stricken post-war populations.

One of the early issues of *The Friend of Peace* sought to convey a graphic estimate of the cost in lives of Napoleon's famed campaign against the Russians:

From the time the French crossed the Niemen in June, to the time the survivors recrossed it in December, was 173 days. Admitting the whole number that perished to be 500,000, the average *daily* sacrifice was 2,890; which amounts to 20,230 per week and more than 80,000 per month. It was equal to 120 every hour, or *two* every minute during the 173 days. That we may have a more impressive view of this dreadful waste of human life, let the numbers before us be compared with the census of the United States in 1810. The average *daily sacrifice* exceeds the whole population of Londonderry in N. H., or Haverhill in Mass., or Windsor in Conn., or Windsor in Vermont.

Dr. McMurdy, of the Arbitration League, was quoting figures he had picked up about 1883, which purported to show that war destroyed annually, on an average (the date when these figures began is not given!) 2,333,333 human beings, or 194,444 per month, 6181 per day, or 270 per hour.

But war destroys, too, man's hard-gained goods in money and material possessions. As far back as 1783 Benjamin Franklin put a pious exclamation point—now that the war was over—to his letter addressed to Joseph Banks:

What vast additions to the conveniences of life might mankind have acquired, if the money spent in wars had been employed in works of public utility![2]

Thirty-five years later Samuel Whelpley took a flyer in "statistics" and lamented the disproportionate expenditures for military purposes:

If the contributions levied on nations for the support of war, or but half the sum, were skillfully disposed of for the aid of the indigent and poor, we would have no poor.[3]

A little better grounded in the use of figures were the writers of the Second Annual Report of the Massachusetts Peace Society, which pointed out that

the annual expense of war to the United States would furnish 108,273,092 copies of quarterly pamphlets, besides extra publications; nearly enough for every family in the world; and the expense of war to Great Britain would supply the same to more than four times the families on the globe. Now we venture to express the belief that such a dispersion of pacific tracts (if practicable) would be found ultimately a more efficacious and permanent security against war, than all the fleets and armies on which nations rely for their safety.

These figures were based on the years during the War of 1812. Taking the year 1815 as a basis for the purchasing power of the money used for war in that twelvemonth compared with its power for the promotion of education, the Society's Committee arrived at the following conclusion (basing education costs on the once-famous and advanced Lancasterian system):

It is reputed that not more than 16 millions can come of age to be educated annually in the world; if, therefore, we allow four years' education to each, 64 millions would constantly require education; consequently three-fifths of the annual war expense to the U. S.; or one-eighth the expense to Great Britain; or one-sixth the expense to France would educate all the children in the world on the Lancasterian plan, at the expense in England.

This by Worcester and his colleagues. Ladd and his fellow-officials of the American Peace Society published a detailed study based on the total expenses of our national government for the year 1833 which, itemized, stood as follows:

For the Civil List	$ 2,717,368
For the Navy	3,926,209
For Pensions	1,555,543
For Internal Improvements	1,282,586
For the Military	3,734,666
For Fortifications	653,000
For the Indians, for land, etc.	1,251,722
Miscellaneous items to make the total	$16,657,669

Of this expense nearly one-half is for war, and if we include the pensions which are paid to soldiers, more than half must be put down to war. Less than one dollar out of sixteen to improve the country, and produce the positive good for which government should be established. Population of the United States in 1830 was 12,856,407. Of these 2,010,436 were slaves.[4]

I hasten to evidence the normal responsiveness to traditional opportunities by contrasting these figures with a recent report of the Secretary of the Treasury, which indicates that in this age of further enlightenment the cost of war—"past, present and future"—amounts to eighty-two cents out of every dollar of federal disbursement.[5]

Not to stretch out details with too much repetition, it is only necessary to state that through succeeding years the peace movement hammered away manfully at the war-cost argument for peace. They used day in and day out for many years Longfellow's verses, written after he and Charles Sumner had gone through the arsenal at Springfield:

> Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
> Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts
> Given to redeem the human mind from error,
> There were no need of arsenals or forts.

They were provided with material in 1917 through the assertion by a strong advocate of industrial preparedness, when we had not yet entered the War, that

> Three days of the war would build the Panama Canal.
> Eight days of the war would rebuild Boston.
> The wages of all the workmen in the United States for ten months would run the war but two weeks.

All the money in the savings banks would carry the war only one month.

The cost of the public schools in 1913 would carry the war less than one week.

The cost has exceeded the expenses of the United States for its 128 years as a nation.[6]

Yet what of that? Speedily we were embroiled and the costs sent sharply skyward.

And nearly a decade after the War had ended, a great drive was on for a huge naval expansion in this country. It was opposed by valiant wielders of figures who massed them—not without effect, since this was peace time—in irresistible phalanx:

The Commissioner of Education reports that there are scattered over the United States several hundred colleges and universities supported by endowment. Of these institutions, several hundred in number, only nine have total endowments exceeding $20,000,000. Every cruiser we build represents, therefore, a greater sum than any endowed college or university in the land possesses, with nine exceptions, of which six are in the East. Moreover, the cruisers wear out or become obsolete and must be shortly replaced at equal or greater expense; but a $20,000,000 university does not die; it becomes ever increasingly effective as the years roll on.[7]

A telling argument, even should there be at its very end a possible *non sequitur!*

Telling, but old. And never so telling, despite its logical force, but what our country has gone to war in every generation.

War and Crime Waves

Not yet have we ceased to hear the reverberations from the guns of post-War bandits. There is one factor in the crime wave following the World War, according to a peace worker who speaks like many,

that is easily recognizable and can be eliminated if people are sufficiently desirous of eliminating it. That factor is war.[8]

A Canadian educator declares:

Since the war the Anglo-Saxon race has been overcome with a plague of vulgarity.[9]

Not only the Anglo-Saxons, it appears; for Francesco Nitti, former premier of Italy, also saw the War's moral damage:

The losses in human life and property in the last war, great as they are, are small evils compared to the undermining of morals and the lowering of standards of culture and civilization.[10]

'Twas ever thus. Witness that pair of innovators, David Dodge and Noah Worcester. Said Dodge:

The state of morals, so much depressed by the American Revolution, was only raised by the blessed effusions of God's holy spirit.[11]

And not, at that, till Worcester, speaking as a veteran, had stated:

Let anyone who was old enough to observe the state of morals prior to our Revolution, ask himself, what was the effect of that war on the morals of New England?[12]

What a disturber of D.A.R. traditions is this man! Yet he spoke out of first-hand knowledge:

The depravity, occasioned by war, is not confined to the army. Every species of vice gains ground in a nation during a war. And when a war is brought to a close, seldom, perhaps, does a community return to its former standard of morals.

Does not this sound familiar? Said *The Friend of Peace* in 1816:

It is not to be doubted, that after the war was over a greater number of criminals were condemned at the Old Bailey [London] in two years, than had been in the same length of time during the war.

The Recorder, in that same year, reported a natural-sounding item:

The New-York State prison is overflowing with convicts. The present number is 722, although the prison was calculated for 500.

Noah Worcester could not pass this by. He elaborates—in

thoroughly modern manner—on the implications of such a state of affairs.

The complaint of an increase of crimes, and of convicts, is not confined to New York; it is so general in our country, that it is time to investigate the causes, and, if possible, to apply some remedy.

The natural increase of population may, perhaps, account for some portion of the evil. The influx of foreigners who had been inured to crime during the wars of Europe may account for a still greater portion. But may we stop here? No, verily. What other cause, then, may be assigned? The enormous increase of convicts, complained of, has principally occurred within four years. Now let it be observed that within *five* years, our country has expended one hundred, perhaps one hundred and fifty millions of dollars, in supporting "a school of vice." Is it not probable that this expense, considering the opportunity which the scholars had to learn, would produce some effects? Can such a number of scholars, as were educated in the business of pillage and piracy, robbery and murder under the sanction of public authority, be let loose upon the community without some display of the proficiency they had made?

Once more not to bring in too much detail, it may suffice to say that through the next fourscore years "the old refrain" was sung in the solemn protests of peace spokesmen. In 1903 the Reverend James M. Buckley, one of our leading clergymen, wrote in *The Century Magazine* on "The Present Epidemic of Crime," and after tracing it to the recent war, he went still further back and said:

Among the influences which have powerfully affected the primary causes of crime, and are sources of this present epidemic, is the effect of the Civil War. . . . The evil done by that war to public and private morality was almost irremediable. Its effects were seen upon Congress, upon politics, upon reconstruction, upon business, upon society, and upon the habits of the people.

The proceedings of the Lake Mohonk Conference for 1907 contain a detailed and documented study of war in its contributory relationship to crime, covering many wars of Europe.

Even in the pastimes of the masses war's effect seemed clear.

There are recurrent post-war protests over cock-fighting; but over prize fights far more tears were shed.

A few years away from the War of 1812—a time when prize fights were not far removed from the character of Roman gladiatorial combats—*The Friend of Peace* had said,

> Boxing has, we presume, been so far abolished in England, as well as in this country, that it is now confined to the lowest and most worthless class of society.[13]

Worcester died sublimely unaware of what was about to happen. With the Mexican War the "fistic art" began to revive in this country; but in England, following the Crimean War that gave the world's peace group a Florence Nightingale to solace them, British prize fighting emerged from the back rooms of "pubs" and illicit cellars, and took to the open with members of Parliament and even of the Cabinet in attendance. Here was a return to the golden days of slugging not seen since the Prince of Wales served as second to Lord Buckingham in a bare-fist grudge encounter of 1790.

Quite naturally, loud cries rose to heaven. When Tom Sayers of England fought Heenan, the heavier American bruiser, to a draw after many blue-blooded Britons had watched the gory fray for two hours and twenty minutes, the London Peace Society (and, following their lead, by reprints, the American Peace Society) spoke to a certain special audience:

> It may, perhaps, serve to awaken salutary reflection in the minds of some of our religious teachers in pulpit and press, who have been stimulating the war spirit and glorifying "muscular Christianity," as to whereunto this thing may grow, when they see the worship of brute force which they have helped to promote, culminating in triumphal ovations given to the champions of the prize ring, such as are rarely accorded either to genius, or virtue, or piety; while these brutal displays themselves, though in flagrant and acknowledged violation of law, are made subjects of formal and elaborate eulogy by Ministers of State in the British Parliament, on grounds and for reasons which would equally justify admiration for pirates and highwaymen; nay, for the very lowest order of brute beasts, who often display in still higher perfection the same qualities for which these pugilistic heroes have won for themselves such distinguished patronage and panegyric.

Once again, a rising tide of protests whittled down the zest of the prize-fight-following gentry. By 1896 one of the American Peace Society's leaders was saying:

> Pugilism is now regarded as degrading and hideous, and is left to the taste of the coarsest and most vulgar of men.[14]

But now the times again have changed. Boxing with six-ounce gloves is ladylike in comparison with the good old days when almost anything was allowed. Our present-day heavy hitters earn more in one fight than a college president can accumulate and spend in a lifetime; they cater to "the best people," and receive the ultimate pronunciamentos of eternal fitness by representation in the sports bay of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine.

Let those who will, seek to speed up the swinging pendulum. The fact remains that all the complaints about war and its fruitage of crime, brutality, false values and low standards rolled up in one great heap to hamper Mars, he crushes beneath his iron feet each time he goes upon the rampage, like so many fallen, dried-up leaves of autumn.

"It's the Newspapers!"

Janus, that two-faced Roman deity, threw open the doors of his temple in times of war and kept them closed in peace. Here is an appropriate symbol for the technique of misinformation without which wars would be less easy to get started. The outward face is propaganda; the face not seen from in front is censorship.

All this, we usually are persuaded, is an invention of the modern military mind. Certainly in the World War the industry of warping public opinion reached its quantitative acme. All the nations used it extensively, though in none was it so elaborately organized as in England and the United States. Germany's propaganda in this country was stupid rather than crafty, never clever enough to seem very plausible, and never sufficiently widespread to wield much influence. France's intensive propaganda drive of the later war years is typified by the

following excerpt from André Tardieu's *The Truth About the Treaty.*

How often Americans have expressed to me the hope that France would be content with an independent and neutral Alsace-Lorraine! How many expressed surprise when, to the statement of our rights, I added that their obvious justice made a plebiscite useless and unacceptable.

A few months later this state of opinion was entirely changed. I venture to believe that the activities of my co-workers and myself, the fifteen thousand lectures in English where young officers, with all the authority of their war record and their wounds, presented the pitiful situation of the captured provinces, had something to do with this transformation. . . .

Thousands of huge posters reproducing Henner's "Alsacienne," with the text of the Bordeaux protest . . . had carried the meaning and scope of our claim to every state in the Union. Support came from all sides. The battle was won.

How Crewe House worked in the United States is vividly shown by Sir Gilbert Parker, in charge of the British "information factory":

I need hardly say that the scope of my department was very extensive and its activities widely ranged. Among the activities was a weekly report to the British cabinet on the state of American opinion and the constant touch with the permanent correspondents of American newspapers in England. I also frequently arranged for important public men in England to act for us by interviews in American newspapers. . . .

Among other things we supplied 360 newspapers in the smaller states of the United States with an English newspaper which gives a weekly review and comment on the affairs of the war. We established connection with the man in the street through cinema pictures of the army and navy, as well as through interviews, articles, pamphlets, etc., and by letters in reply to individual American critics, which were printed in the chief newspaper of the State in which they lived and were copied in newspapers of other and neighboring states.

We advised and stimulated many people to write articles; we utilized the friendly services and assistance of confidential friends; we had reports from important Americans constantly, and established association, by personal correspondence, with influential and eminent people of every profession in the United States beginning with university and college presidents, professors and scientific men, and running through all the ranges of the population.

We asked our friends and correspondents to arrange for speeches, debates, and lectures by American citizens, but we did not encourage Britishers to go to America and preach the doctrine of entrance into the war. Besides an enormous private correspondence with individuals, we had our documents and literature sent to great numbers of public libraries, Y.M.C.A. societies, universities, colleges, historical societies, clubs, and newspapers.

It is hardly necessary to say that the work was one of extreme difficulty and delicacy.[15]

On our own part, the government organized a Committee on Public Information with George Creel as chairman. According to a record proudly published by Mr. Creel, the Committee utilized "the printed word, the spoken word, the motion picture, the telegraph, the cable, the wireless, the poster, the signboard." [16] One hundred and fifty thousand men and women devoted themselves to specialized activities. Thirty booklets, characterized to hindsight as composed of half truths and "lies by silence," were prepared by prominent historians; of these, 75,000,000 copies were used in the United States and many millions abroad. A corps of 75,000 speakers operating in 5200 communities delivered 755,190 speeches as Four Minute Men. Says a critic:

> Translators, advertisers, artists, publicists, movie actors and producers were called in to help. Libraries and reading rooms were flooded with pamphlets and books; movie plots included "Huns" that looked not half as civilized as the Neanderthal man, "Huns" who never saw a church but they set fire to it, who cut the hands off every child they met. "Actual war pictures" were produced immediately outside New York City. Pulpits and lecture platforms were filled by hysterical men and women, victims of this poisonous propaganda, who were "doing their bit" to spread more hatred. All this is called a "record of stainless patriotism and unspotted Americanism." [17]

Too much blame should never be leveled at any body of individuals for war propaganda; they only served a cause, as loyally as they could, in the true spirit of warfare. As Arthur Ponsonby says forcefully, "In war-time, failure to lie is negligence, the doubting of a lie is a misdemeanor, the declaration of the truth a crime." [18]

Meanwhile, in charge of the military censorship section of

the Military Intelligence Division, was Rupert Hughes, author of a life of the First President written to correct the generally false perspective on Washington. Ten years later Mr. Hughes had the frankness to admit a lot:

I could secure the suppression of any newspaper, book, photograph, news item or speech by putting certain machinery in motion. I did my best to prevent anybody from saying a good word for the Germans or a bad word for any of our Allies. I was particularly eager that nobody should say a word against war in general, and that war in particular.[19]

There was ample justification for the statement of a plain-speaking war-made pacifist:

We cannot successfully carry on a modern war if we tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. But if we can make ourselves think that the enemy are "boche," "swine," "Huns," "devils," and "baby-killers," we can believe that we are rendering God service by ridding the world of such demons.[20]

Yet all such customs are not modern. Said the *Solemn Review* in 1814:

If anything be done by the army of one nation, which is deemed by the other as contrary to the modern usages in war, how soon do we hear the exclamations of *Goths and Vandals!* Yet, what are Christians at war, better than those barbarous tribes? and what is the war spirit in them, better than the spirit of Goths and Vandals? When the war spirit is excited, it is not always to be circumscribed in its operations, by the refinements of civilization.

David Low Dodge had also complained about the press:

Newspapers must be ushered forth with flaming pieces to rouse, as it is called, the spirit of the countries, so as to impress upon the populace the idea that the approaching war is just and necessary, for all wars must be just and necessary on both sides.[21]

Jonathan Dymond asked a common rhetorical question:

When a war is in contemplation, or when it has begun, what are the endeavors of its promoters? They animate us by every artifice of excitement to hatred and animosity. Pamphlets, Placards, Newspapers, Caricatures—every agent is in requisition to irritate us into malignity. Nay, dreadful as it is, the pulpit resounds with

declamations to stimulate our too sluggish resentment, and invite us to slaughter.[22]

Noah Worcester appealed directly to the peace societies that he visioned, before they had been born:

> Should peace societies be formed, several points will demand their attention.
>
> In the first place, it will behove them to investigate some mode for effecting a reformation in the manner of conducting newspapers—some mode which shall make it for the interest of editors to exclude from their papers every thing of a vindictive and inflammatory character; and to give the preference to such things, as are of a pacific, friendly, and uniting tendency.

His admonition has been heeded by the peace societies, and heeded ever since. Short of censorship for peace, in which nobody believes, they have not yet found a better solution than to present the facts in their always struggling journals.

Positively it may be asserted that all their labors to counteract war propaganda have not diminished it, when a crisis comes, one least iota. As long as we have war at all, the necessity for war lies will be paramount; and until we throttle war, we may expect to see the prostitution of truth continue to thrive, bold and unashamed.

The Plea of Personages

If there is anything conducive to sardonic merriment among the gods who preside over political circles, it must be the spectacle of anti-war workers seizing upon each reed of pacific sentiment that springs up in the fields of fame and nailing to it the flag of peace.

Every four years thousands of peace workers go out and vote for a presidential candidate whose faith in peace methods to obtain world peace is about as deep as the skin on a cannon ball. Only on rare occasions they have found their confidence not betrayed.

Always, however, the peace movement has sought the endorsement of the mighty. The pacific utterances of the president in office at a given time have been grasped at and used to

win converts to the peace cause; the converts, however, promptly following their national leader whenever he went in a non-pacific direction.

So far has this custom spread that one of our livest peace organizations in 1926 was circulating petitions asking our delegates to a preparatory disarmament conference to place "universal abolition of conscription and complete world disarmament" on the agenda—a most excellent move; but stating beforehand at the top of the petition, "Believing with President Coolidge that 'No nation ever had an army large enough to guarantee it against attack.' " [23] Of course President Coolidge did not believe in universal abolition of conscription or complete world disarmament, if indeed he believed seriously in any disarmament at all. Probably, also, signers in general, persuaded by the prestige of the Presidential lead-off, would vanish from the support of peace projects the very moment the President decided to propose a naval increase—as he later did!

One of the first ambitions of the Massachusetts Peace Society was to gain the endorsement of the President and others politically influential. With Madison, then President, they made little direct headway. No. I of *The Friend* purported to be "A Special Interview between the President of the United States and Omar, an Officer Dismissed for Duelling," and it was tantamount to an "open letter." Followed "Six Letters to the President."

The energetic Worcester addressed himself, with more returns to show for it, to the two living Ex-Presidents, Thomas Jefferson and John Adams. Adams replied on the sixth of February, 1816, to a letter inviting his support:

> I have also read, almost all the days of my life, the solemn reasonings, and pathetic declamations of Erasmus, of Fénelon, of St. Pierre, and many others against war, and in favor of peace. My understanding and my heart accorded with them, at first blush. But alas! a longer and more extensive experience has convinced me, that wars are as necessary, and as inevitable, in our system, as Hurricanes, Earthquakes, and Volcanoes.
>
> Our beloved country, Sir, is surrounded by enemies of the most dangerous, because the most powerful and unprincipled character.

Collisions of national interest, of commercial and manufacturing rivalries are multiplying around us. Instead of discouraging a martial spirit, in my opinion it ought to be excited. We have not enough of it to defend us by sea or land. Universal and perpetual peace, appears to me, no more nor less than everlasting passive obedience and non resistance. The human flock would soon be fleeced and butchered by one or a few. I cannot therefore, Sir, be a subscriber or a member of your society.

Without pausing to wonder who, exactly, would butcher the human flock, since Wells' invading Martians were not then invented, it may be remarked that at first the hopeful Worcester fared but little better with the sage of Monticello. Kind, but discreet, the elderly solon of democracy replied:

Age, and its effects both on body and mind, has weaned my attention from public subjects, and left me unequal to the labors of correspondence beyond the limits of my personal concerns. I retire therefore from the question with a sincere wish, that your writings may have effect in lessening this greatest of human evils, and that you may retain life and health to enjoy the contemplation of this happy spectacle; and pray you to be assured of my great respect.

After so courteous a response, however, the peace promoter persistently sent to Jefferson his pamphlets as he got them out, and it was not long before announcement was made in *The Friend of Peace* that Jefferson had consented to be listed as an Honorary Member of the Massachusetts Peace Society.

From the second annual report of the Massachusetts Peace Society, December 25, 1817, we find that

It has been particularly the aim of the Executive Committee to excite the attention of men of intelligence and respectability, whose opinions and exertions would have influence on others. In this attempt they have been successful.

The word "respectable" had a more literal connotation than it does to-day. Even so, the efforts of the peace movement from that time to this to enlist the support of famous personages have indeed been strenuous. If an early peace society could not report a list of members impressive from mere numbers, the next best thing was to assure a skeptical world that

all in the peace movement was well, by noting the "respectable gentlemen" who had dignified the cause by their adherence. They have not been content to let the cause win through on its merits, nor have they seen how superior were their own leaders, often, to the more eminent but also more compromising dignitaries to whose stars of destiny they had hitched their frail little go-carts.

Even as recently as 1917, the Yearbook of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, blazing with a red heading, "Peace Through Victory," gave as one reason for reprinting the address of William Jay on stipulated arbitration, the

> importance to show that believers in international peace are not recruited only from the emotional class [sic] and that they have what seems to be indispensable in a democracy, a respectable ancestry.

A nationally known leader of the peace movement went so far as to say:

> The talk of vox populi is often more of delusion than a reality. Let us make enough of the preachers, teachers, editors, and particularly statesmen to see the reasonableness and inevitableness of the new order, and it can be at once established and the great changes made.[24]

Long before, Lord Acton, hardly accusable of "sour grapes," had wittily remarked to Bishop Creighton that "Nearly all great men are bad men. Power is poison. . . . Imagine a class of such celebrities as More, Bacon, Grotius, Pascal, Cromwell, Bossuet, Montesquieu, Jefferson, Napoleon, Pitt. The result would be an encyclopedia of error."

Be that as it may, the peace movement has always been a greater respecter of persons than the devout could find authority for in Scripture or the non-religious in the experience of everyday observation.

The serious defect of this technique in obtaining popular influence is twofold.

It induces not a thoughtful understanding, but a merely imitative following—just the kind the peace movement can rely

on least in peace or war. And it teaches people who are already warmly interested in peace to follow open-mindedly not the leadership of the peace groups, but instead the leadership of those who as a rule are loyal to peace only when the skies are fair. The peace movement ought not to put its trust in princes.

It matters little in the long run—and the winning of peace is certain to be no overnight affair—whether a few or a great many more people are persuaded to a temporary allegiance. It matters incalculably whether there is being built up a body of informed, intelligent, and, above all, independent public opinion free from mob-mindedness either for peace or war, but which can be counted on to the crack of doom because it has thought its way through, even though it has not yet worked its way through, the barriers which lie across the path to peace.

The Appeal to Horror

Looking back at the uproar created by the introduction of each new destructive weapon, one can almost fancy the conclaves of tree dwellers or cave men, shaking shaggy heads over the novelty and unfairness of stone-headed spears in contrast to the comparatively humane clubs hitherto employed in the chase and in clan combat. Well, they probably decided, fighting would soon have to cease now such murderous weapons were invented.

The Gauls no doubt felt something like this when they ruminated on the future of Cæsar's wall-scaling enginery. There were many who felt that powder and ball had signalized the coming end of war. Buckle, in his *History of Civilization in England* (1857), prophesied that the intellect of man would revolt against war and overthrow it, in view of the increasing potency of gunpowder, and the development of political economy and easy locomotion. Victor Hugo expressed the belief that mechanical inventions and scientific research, in their application to the manufacture of war instruments, were reaching a state of perfection where, in a short time, the destruction of life in war would be so terrible that sheer necessity would compel people to abolish warfare. The same prophecy

was made with the coming of iron ships. Jan Bliokh, the Polish writer, toward the close of the last century asserted that men could no longer stand the horror of modern war and war, therefore, was doomed. When submarines came in, the cry was lifted up again, and yet again with the arrival of the airplane. It has been raised—though briefly!—regarding poison gas. Even such a man as Dr. Antonio de Bustamente, member of the World Court, was led into the same old cliché. When interviewed after the Pan-American Conference of 1928 he said:

> War itself, and science, are doing more to end war than any human agency or diplomatic agency. It is becoming so horrible that people revolt at it.[25]

The *New York Times,* in the tones of a discoverer, editorialized a few months later in like vein:

> The conviction grows that the more horrible war can be made to appear, the brighter is the promise that mankind will cease to settle disputes by appeal to arms.

When our delegation went to the first Hague Conference of 1899, they bore instructions not to support any limitation on warlike inventions, on the following ground:

> It is doubtful if wars are to be diminished by rendering them less destructive, for it is the plain lesson of history that the periods of peace have been longer protracted as the cost and destructiveness of war have increased.[26]

Mankind ought to have recoiled from war in horror long ago; and yet it has not done so. Even when menaced by overwhelming force and terrible superiority in weapons men seem to have fought, if anything, more readily and bravely.

This is one lesson militarists have never had the wit to learn. Terrorize a foe, has been their view, and he will never dare withstand you. Ruthless destruction has often been considered the most merciful way to get peace—peace the way the ruthless wanted it. Our own General Sheridan, while being fêted in Berlin during the Franco-Prussian War, and when the question was raised whether the French peasants in Bazeilles

had been too harshly treated—as some of the German staff thought they had—counseled stern measures to Bismarck. The recorder says:

. . .Abeken considered that Bazeilles was hardly treated, and thought the war ought to be conducted in a more humane manner. Sheridan, to whom MacLean has translated these remarks, is of a different opinion. He considers that in war it is expedient, even from the political point of view, to treat the population with the utmost rigour also. He expressed himself roughly as follows: "The proper strategy consists in the first place in inflicting as telling blows as possible upon the enemy's army, and then in causing the inhabitants so much suffering that they must long for peace, and force their Government to demand it. The people must be left nothing but their eyes to weep with over the war." Somewhat heartless, it seems to me, but perhaps, worthy of consideration.[27]

In the courage of people under the rigors of invasion, siege, and all-around devastation militarists never exhibit trust, though they of all people ought to have a higher estimate of human fortitude. *Shrecklichkeit* usually induces resistance rather than surrender. Fear does not end conflict but renders its prolongation all but inevitable.

And that is why it impresses one as strange that the peace movement has so steadily inculcated war-horror through its speeches and printed matter. Many of the earlier peace periodicals, especially, rivaled the worst exhibits of Mme. Tussaud's wax works or the Eden Musée. Rapine, pillage, burning, slaughter, torture—all the horrible aspects of war were thrust home like the red point of a hot poker. As early as 1813, Jacob Catlin wrote on *The Horrors of War.*

Passing years brought no let-up. At the close of the last century two pamphlets sold widely by the peace societies were "A Battle, As It Appeared to An Eye-witness," and "War As It Is." To-day peace periodicals follow the old method, though they are more dignified than their forerunners and less like our daily "tabloids."

Cauterization may be necessary for the wounds of war; those who do not do the fighting ought to know what war is like lest they move toward it too easily. But the steady recital of war's

cruelty as used in articles appearing by the hundreds since 1816, or the spine-shivering accounts of "the next war" so often indulged in by writers and speakers in the peace societies, are likely to assume in their minds the character less of a mere description than of a rehearsal.

The fact is obvious, I contend, that men are not as a rule cowardly; that they will not be deterred from war by the terrors of it so long as they deem it right and necessary.

It would be to dwell in a fool's paradise not to hammer home the *danger* of war and its effect on the future of the race. But to dwell on its horrors as a deterrent is unsound psychologically. And even to point out the danger of war unaccompanying such warnings with a definite hope of war's abolition and a program on which, however far-reaching, people may begin to act at once, is merely to defeat the high ends that peace makers have in view.

All the alarms of impending eruptions do not serve to keep people from building their homes under the shoulders of volcanic mountains. Even the threat of hell fire has served morality but poorly.

You can frighten people into war, but you can't scare them out of it. The effect, especially in a rather effete civilization, is not entirely unlike that achieved by a window made opaque except for one round transparent hole, labeled "Don't look in here." You know, of course, what happens.

Anticipating Norman Angell

"What *The Great Illusion* did," says its justly famous author, "was to show why in numberless relations in the modern world, particularly in international relationships, physical preponderance, military victory, coercion, cannot give those results in political security and economic advantage, which men had always heretofore assumed as a matter of course." [28]

Essentially a sound proposal, it is not as new as people usually think. In 1816 the Reverend Thomas Chalmers of England called for just such a work as Mr. Angell obligingly produced some ninety-four years later. Said he, in laying out tasks to which lovers of peace might turn their hands:

Let another pour the light of modern [sic] speculation into the mysteries of trade, and prove, that not a single war has been undertaken for any of its objects, where the millions and the millions more, which were lavished on the cause, have not all been cheated away from us by the phantom of an imaginary interest.

As far back as 1788 Benjamin Franklin had written to Johannes Ingenhousz, the Dutch physician:

I grieve at the wars Europe is engaged in, and wish they were ended; for I fear even the victors will be losers.

Before this—in 1763—an English tract by Josiah Tucker was circulated in this country, *The Case of Going to War for the Sake of Procuring, Enlarging, or Securing of Trade, considered in a New Light.* "Conquer the whole world," said Bentham in his *Principles of International Law,* "it is impossible you should increase your trade one halfpenny:—it is impossible you should do otherwise than diminish it."

Samuel Whelpley in 1818 ventured to inquire, "Does joy return to the nation whose army is victorious?" In 1832 the peace journals were reprinting Franklin's letter to his sister, written from Philadelphia, September 20, 1783, after a hard day's work in the constitutional convention, in which he said:

I agree with you perfectly in your Disapprobation of War. Abstracted from the Inhumanity of it, I think it wrong in Point of Human Providence, for whatever Advantages one Nation would obtain from another, whether it be Part of their Territory, the Liberty of Commerce with them, free Passage on their Rivers, etc., etc., it would be much cheaper to purchase such Advantages with ready Money, than to pay the Expense of acquiring it by War. . . . It seems to me that if Statesmen had a little more Arithmetic, or were more accustomed to Calculation, Wars would be much less frequent.

Professor Upham also developed the idea, in 1836, and a bit more aptly:

And can there, so far as the national resources and wealth are concerned, be any reasonable doubt as to the injurious and destructive tendency of wars! "England and France (says Bonaparte in one of his Conversations at St. Helena) held in their hands the fate of the world, and particularly that of European civilization.

What injury did we not do to each other! What good might we not have done! Under Pitt's system (he says nothing of his own guilt) we desolated the world, and what has been the result? You imposed on France a tax of fifteen hundred millions of francs and raised it by means of Cossacks. I laid a tax of seven hundred millions (probably meaning pounds sterling) on you and made you raise it with your own hands by your parliament. Even now after the victory you have obtained, *who can tell, whether you may not sooner or later sink under the burden?"* In this last inquiry, by whatever jealousy of spirit it might have been prompted in Napoleon, there is something worthy of the attention of the friends of England. Great Britain, with all the wealth of her cities and the grandeur of her nobles, with all the resources of her commerce, and the unrivalled skill of her manufacturers, finds it difficult to conceal it from the world, that her giant footsteps are treading on the brink of bankruptcy. If she fails, it will be the result of war, of *victorious* war; for war is destructive to the victors, as well as the vanquished.

The trouble is that those who make the wars don't do the paying for them. The destinies of all within a country are not so closely wrapped up as appears to nationalistic vision. Though a nation's masses may suffer ruinously from a war—victors along with vanquished—war breeders in all countries fatten and enjoy prosperity or at least a coveted prestige.

Until freed from nationalism, populations may still be driven out to die and kill in a process guaranteed to wreak calamity on the majority of survivors.

In any event, the peculiar benefits derived by many in the United States during the World War make this country sterile soil indeed for such a doctrine as *The Great Illusion.* This time at any rate, by selling munitions and everything else at a terrific rate before we entered the War, we managed pretty well. There is, however, another side even to that; for by selling bonds to pay for the War instead of instituting a drastic war taxation or a capital levy, the cost of the War was transferred chiefly to the workers of this and succeeding generations. But that the people do not see, and their reaction to war is going to be, of course, not to what it is and does, but to what they think it is and does. To short sight, and in a country which experienced

the actual ravages of warfare comparatively little, the financial risks of victorious war have about as great a threat as the possible danger of a rocking chair to a new-made champion flagpole sitter.

The Imbecility of War

There are those who believe the moral, religious and economic appeal against war is of little practical value in affecting public opinion. Such a one is Lord Ponsonby, the British pacifist and statesman, who says in his *Now Is the Time:*

> The religious, humanitarian, and economic arguments against war by no means cover the whole ground. I now come to what I will call the rationalist argument, which, to my mind, is by far the strongest, the most useful, but hitherto the least developed.
>
> War may be wrong, but the churches have never unanimously condemned it. War is cruel and barbarous, but people will not on that account ask for its abolition. War is wasteful, but people do not count the costs. The supporters of war, therefore, admit that they are ready to undertake something which can be morally condemned, and which is increasingly cruel and expensive, because by it some specific object can be secured.
>
> *I maintain that by far the most tragic thing about war, is not its immorality, nor its cruelty, but its manifest and colossal futility and imbecility.* I maintain that war achieves no single object of advantage in the high sense to anyone, nor does it attain any of the supposed aims for which it is waged.

Though William Jay shortly before 1845 wrote on "The Inefficacy of War," there is strikingly scant use of the direct appeal to reason, in the peace movement's history, on such grounds as Lord Ponsonby's. Even this argument, however, appears to contain weaknesses. Though the churches in face of an early conflict would probably show a real gain over their record in the World War, Lord Ponsonby is certainly right in not expecting any "unanimous" condemnation. And as I have just indicated, there seems little chance for the argument of war's barbarity.

But why assume any better luck with so logical a proposition as war's supreme stupidity? That happier result will come only

when all argument is reënforced—as Lord Ponsonby also believes—by a strong minority movement among the people to dramatize the issue and rouse the apathetic masses; and which through definite action repudiates war on grounds which are, whatever the outward differences of individual expression, essentially compounded of revolt both against war's ethical atavism and its quintessential folly.

CHAPTER XII

MORE ARGUMENTS OF THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

The logic of one age is not that of another. It is one of the chief useful purposes of a study of the mores to learn to discern in them the operation of traditional error, prevailing dogmas, logical fallacy, delusion, and current false estimates of goods worth striving for.—WILLIAM GRAHAM SUMNER, *Folkways.*

CHAPTER XII

MORE ARGUMENTS OF THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

War and Liberty

WHEN the World War sucked the United States into its bloody whirlpool, cartoonists sprang to crayons and rendered what service they could to the cause of "democracy." None of them, however, drew a certain picture that would have shown the actual situation.

That picture would have revealed an ocean—the Atlantic. Germany on the far side, the United States on this. On our shores a brick building, in process of completion. Label on door: DEMOCRACY. An outraged, highly overwrought Uncle Sam is shying bricks, one after the other across the waves, in an effort to smash a sinister castle. The esteemed Uncle is desperately tearing the bricks out of his own fair structure, to its rapid ruin.

Nor did any artist depict a certain other scene. Uncle Sam, worried by a pool of ink on his floor, kneels anxiously and presses over it a blotter. Legend on puddle: MILITARISM; on blotter, FREEDOM, Result: what might naturally be expected.

In that last great conflict there was an active, intelligent, and courageous organization, the American Civil Liberties Union known then as the Civil Liberties Bureau, an outgrowth of the American Union against Militarism. Since it was seeking to preserve the spirit of free press, free speech, and free assembly embodied, for instance, in the first article of the Bill of Rights, the opening word of its title has nobly justified itself.

Such an organization was needed as never before. Free speech, of course, was rigorously repressed in all of our war periods, but never quite so thoroughly. There was open, unpun-

ished skepticism about the holy wisdom of our War of 1812, and the Reverend Benjamin Bell did not hesitate to utter and publish—and "got away with it"—some bitter animadversions on federal officials. Declaring it to be "impolitic and unnecessary, and consequently murderous," he queried whether the administration leaders waging the War were "fit to hold the reins of government and direct the destinies of the nation," expressing the opinion that "they, who say they are, either betray great ignorance or wickedness or both." "Do they not richly merit the title of the murderers of their subjects? Ought they not like the tyrant Nero to be branded with perpetual infamy, and 'damned to eternal fame'?" He also "obstructed recruiting."

> Let me entreat you, my dear hearers, if you have any regard to God and your fellow men—to your own honor, and peace of conscience in a dying hour, and to your future happiness, not to say, or do any thing, in the least, to encourage others to enlist to go, and fight against their fathers and mothers, sisters and brothers, in Canada—on the lake or ocean; for you will not prosper.[1]

One of the richest satires ever published in wartime was *The Wars of the Gulls,* circulated in 1812, "in three chapters":

Chapter I. Shewing how, and why, and with whom the Gulls went to war.

Chapter II. Shewing how the Gulls make the deep to boil like a pot.

Chapter III. Shewing how a certain doughty General of the Gulls goes forth to play the game of HULL-GULL in Upper Canada,

> "And from the pinnacle of glory,
> Falls headlong into purgatory."

Says this "Historical Romance":

> It was on a foggy afternoon, such as Virginians are accustomed to counteract with a *mint julep,* and such as cloudy heads find congenial to cogitation; that the Sage of Montpelier, the commander in chief of the armies of the Gulls, retired to his lolling chair to ponder on the destinies of the nation. The declaration of war, by virtue of which the whole nation of Gulls were to pounce *unguibus et rostro* upon the unprotected heads of the *Bulls,* their

lawfully appointed enemies, was in his hand. A map of British America was under his feet. . . . The margins and spaces usually blank because unexplored, were copiously filled with the names of their future dignitaries, the favorites of their puissant commander. Here was a viceroy of Labrador, and there was a collector of customs on McKenzie's River. A victorious general was military governor over the fragments of Quebec, while an uncouth looking colonel was plenipo. to the Dog-Ribbed Indians. "Who," said the chief of the Gulls, as he cast one eye over his dependancies, "who can like me put his thumb on a whole continent at once? What potentate so colossal that in bestriding his empire, he can cool one toe upon the north pole, while he warms the other at the southernmost cape in Florida?"

In the Northeast the Mexican War was boldly denounced; Lincoln, though he voted in Congress for war credits, nevertheless spoke forcibly against the War itself.

Kindly as he was by nature, however, he permitted a despotic slaughter of civil rights from 'sixty-one to 'sixty-five; although he hardly secured such immunity to criticism as Woodrow Wilson demanded and ruthlessly enforced.

Though the Universal Peace Union experienced one riot during the Spanish-American War and was expelled from its quarters in Philadelphia's old Independence Hall, its outspoken leaders were not jailed, nor were its publications blackjacked by the Post Office Department; and the American Peace Society's frank comments in *The Advocate of Peace,* if they opened the vials of wrath, found in them nothing more lethal than the soured milk of human kindness.

Active spokesmen for the peace movement have been thoroughly alert to the dangerous effect of war and militarism on democracy and freedom. David Low Dodge, on the inception of the War of 1812, tried to make his countrymen realize the threat to liberty:

> If we examine the history of nations we shall find that they have generally lost their liberties in consequence of the spirit and practice of war. . . . Where martial law is proclaimed, liberty is cast down, and despotism raises her horrid ensign in its place and fills the dungeons and scaffolds with her victims.

The Noah of Boston, braving the reefs of militarism on one

side and the shoals of fundamentalism on the other, steered his ark as few would then have dared:

> In all the writings of Thomas Paine, he never advanced a more just sentiment, than what he affirmed of war,—"It is the art of conquering at home."

William Ladd was also at some pains to make his meaning unmistakable:

> It is wonderful that the chief who most frequently breaks over the limits of the constitution, tramples on the laws and infringes on the liberty of his fellow citizens,—if only successful in attacking an enemy, or repelling an invasion—is hailed as the savior of his country, and receives all the honors, which that country can confer;—as though territory were dearer to us than our liberties.

And he added, profoundly:

> No country was ever free but once.

Eight years afterwards Leonard Bacon was also saying:

> An intelligent nation, jealous for its liberties, will always be jealous of armies and warlike armaments, and therefore will always be opposed to a war policy.[2]

Militarism, the real "enemy within," was seen in its true rôle by Thomas C. Upham, who declared that

> War always has been, and so long as it continues to be practiced, always *will* be, the bane of freedom. . . . When do we find prisons filled with persons, guilty of nothing which in the ordinary condition of the community would be considered a crime?

There is no need to enumerate in wearisome redundance the sharp lances of argument leveled at war by the defenders of freedom. Suffice it to indicate with necessary reiteration that this plea, too, has been thus far unavailing and seems likely to possess no added potency in the days that stretch before us.

"Let Rulers Fight It Out"

Resentment, tinctured with irony, has frequently prompted the suggestion that war-makers be allowed to determine the issue themselves on the field of honor. When it comes to finding

rulers and statesmen actually in battle, however, every square foot of every sector is a no-man's land. As far as actual personal combat is concerned, every "slacker" in Leavenworth is a "very model of a modern major-general."

There was acid, perhaps, in Dodge's analysis, but who can say it was devoid of justification?

> Very few, comparatively, who are instigators of war, actually take the field of battle, and are seldom seen in the front of fire. It is usually those who are rioting on the labors of the poor that fan up the flame of war.

Two blistering lines from an unnamed poet appeared in *The American Advocate of Peace* for December, 1835, regarding that class of citizens which Mr. H. G. Wells, in a later period, described as the "fergawdsakers":

> Secure from actual warfare, we have lov'd
> To swell the war-whoop, passionate for war!

There is a certain warrant for such a feeling. The French Senate, recently, rejected a section of M. Paul Boncour's bill for the mobilization of France's entire population in war time, which would have allowed the conscription of members of Parliament.

Samuel E. Coues, President of the old American Peace Society in the 'eighteen-forties, gave a clever riposte to the taunts of his critics:

> I have heard non-resistance ridiculed; but nations require non-resistance with a witness. Rulers declare war at pleasure, and then expect the people, without resistance, inquiry or reflection, to submit, and go forth to kill and be killed. Here is non-resistance with a vengeance!

Elihu Burritt in 1846 sarcastically noted the fact that

> Kings, Presidents, Governors, Representatives, never pay nor fight. These vulgar duties are left to the People.

Don Arturo de Marcoartu in 1876 complained strenuously about "the unrestricted power conferred on the heads of nations—even in representative monarchies—to dictate war with-

out expressly consulting, by a 'plebiscitum,' the very people they are sending to death."

Nothing more iniquitous can be imagined than to see the instigators of war in the Press, the Tribune, and the Parliament holding themselves aloof from, and keeping out of the range of, war's missiles, and leaving the unhappy people who yearn for peace to face the cannon's mouth. . . . The power to declare war ought to be again deposited in the hands of the people, to be exercised by means of a plebiscite, and neither the head of the state nor society possess any just right to compel a population to fight who may refuse voluntarily to offer their lives for that purpose.

If universal suffrage is at any time justifiable, if a duty of conscience ever imposes it as a duty to listen to the *vox populi,* it is assuredly when the nation is called upon to declare war.[8]

Dr. McMurdy, of the National Arbitration League, wrote in his 1884 report:

Every proposition for declaring war should be referred to the people. If a majority favor it, let this majority do the fighting, substitutions being forbidden by law.

Belva A. Lockwood prefaced a pamphlet of 1901 with the quotation:

Let those who make the battles be the only ones to fight.

In 1911 Allen S. Will of the *Baltimore Sun* asked of the Third American Peace Congress:

How many of the world's wars have been, as Tennyson says, broad-based upon the people's will? If war is for the benefit of ambitious princes, politicians, agitators and other harpies who usually dominate at a time when organized conflict is impending, it may well be that the decision should be left to them; but if it is for the benefit of the nation—and this is always the guise in which it is presented—is it not just that the judgment of the people should approve the necessity for such a tragic enterprise before they embark on it?

It was Kant who insisted that if war was to be eradicated, the civil constitution in every state should be republican, and war should not be declared except upon a plebiscite of all citizens.

Few decades have since passed, I venture to believe, in which a covert or an openly challenging expression of this complaint against autocracy has not been made. On a recent lecture tour to the United States, General Fritz V. Holm, a Danish lecturer, writer and war correspondent, rattled the old bones anew. He proposed a law (which has been agitated for Denmark) providing that if a nation becomes involved in war the following measures shall be put into effect within ten hours:

A. There shall be enlisted as simple soldiers or simple sailors with rank of privates, in the nation's armed forces on land (although only in the infantry shock troops), or at sea (although only for service on board submarines), or in the air, for the earliest possible participation in actual hostilities under fire against the enemy, the following persons:

1. The Head of the State, if male, whether president or monarch.
2. All male blood relatives of the Head of State having attained the age of sixteen years.
3. All civilian officials, and military, naval and air officers attached to the household of the Head of State.
4. The Prime Minister and other Secretaries of State, as well as all Under and Assistant Secretaries of State, of the Government, except the Secretary of State for Peace, hereinafter mentioned.
5. All representatives elected by the nation for legislative work, viz: all members of Parliamentary or Congressional bodies, of both Lower and Upper Houses, except such members as voted openly against said armed conflict or war.
6. All Bishops and prelates or ecclesiasts of similar rank of the nation's Christian and other churches, whether state churches or no.

The above enlistments as privates are for the duration of the armed conflict or war and are enforced in disregard of the individual's age and/or condition of health, upon which the military officers will pass after enlistment.

Relatives Included

B. There shall be enlisted as simple nurses or servants in the medical auxiliaries of the army, and for service only at the front, as near actual hostilities under fire as dressing stations and/or field hospitals are established, the following persons:

7. The Head of the State, if female.

8. All female blood relatives of the Head of State having attained the age of sixteen years, and all male relatives according to A-2.

9. All female officials attached to the household of the Head of State, and all male functionaries according to A-3.

10. All present wives, all daughters of present marriages, and all sisters, provided said women are entitled to vote at general elections, of the persons mentioned under A-(1-6).

The above enlistments as simple nurses or servants are for the duration of the armed conflict or war, and are enforced in disregard of the individual's age or condition of health, upon which the military medical officers will pass after enlistment.

No Promotions

C. Promotion in rank, even for conspicuous military or medical service, is denied the persons mentioned under A) and B) forever; but their services, if worthy, may be recompensed with available national decorations.

D. The official positions vacated by the enlistments of the persons under A) and B) shall be filled immediately by their pre-elected or pre-appointed deputy successors as follows:

x. The position of Head of State is filled by the Secretary of State for Peace, hereinafter mentioned.

y. The positions of Prime Minister and of other Secretaries of State, including Under and Assistant Secretaries of State, are filled by the successors deputed for that purpose at the preceding general elections, or by previous appointment by the Head of State.

z. The positions of the elected representatives of the nation, except those who voted against the armed conflict or war in question, and who therefore remain in office, are filled by their deputy successors, designated at the preceding general elections.

This is a scheme of charming simplicity, calculated to tickle at once the imagination and one's sense of justice. It is a sort of stern fairness all but reduced to the absurd. The underlying principle has never made much headway, nor will the more elaborate modernization—for at least two major reasons.

First, if wars are to be fought at all, nations fighting them will not and cannot do other than fight as efficiently as possible; and efficiency demands that we select the physically fit young men—the males at least thus far in warfare—and send them out to slaughter and be slaughtered in trivial millions.

Second, because it is a fallacy to assume that war makers are physical cowards. Call them stupid, heap on them every kind of invective you can think of, and there might be truth in different degrees in all your accusations. But if the politicians, military leaders, imperialists and superpatriots who are especially responsible for most of the world's wars could be convinced that the winning of a war rested more on their going into combat instead of other posts behind the lines, the great majority would go as bravely and unquestioningly as that unthinking Light Brigade whose brute-like plasticity and dumb valor Tennyson immortalized.

During the years just before the United States entered the World War and for a time thereafter, the idea of a war referendum was brought forward by one or two progressive Congressmen. The scheme is not new; it was promoted by Continental socialism extensively between 1890 and 1907. The most prominent recent spokesman for it is Alanson B. Houghton, former Ambassador at the Court of St. James. At Harvard University's commencement exercises in 1927 he vigorously presented the case for a popular vote before war. He has since reiterated the proposal several times. Even when running for the Senate in New York State in the 1928 elections, he stated at a political rally:

> The power to declare war, it must be remembered, stands on a different plane from all other powers of government. It is the one power which of all others a self-governing people would logically reserve to itself, since it puts in jeopardy their collective lives and property. And yet, strangely enough, it is the one power they do not directly possess.[4]

One man has probably put more solid work on the war referendum project than any other. He is Dr. Thomas Hall Shastid, of Duluth, Minnesota. He has spoken before many audiences; he has drawn together in a small organization a number of others who put strong faith in his plan; he has issued a great many pamphlets of a popular nature, and a book, *Give the People Their Own War Power.*

He has worked out the text of an Amendment to the Con-

stitution embodying his plan, and has published answers to a multitude of common questions raised by critics of the referendum project.

Clearly, delay would be an essential feature of any such referendum; the thirty days required in Dr. Shastid's Amendment would be a practical minimum. Every moment of delay would afford an opportunity for a public discussion of the international issues at stake, whereas at present such discussion as there is must be centered in the question of what the government is going to do, instead of what you are going to do yourself.

On the other hand, a period of delay would be far from a guarantee of peace. It would mean that the forces of peace and the forces of war would settle down to a grim battle of rival propaganda. In such a race for public opinion it is by no means certain that special interests, such as unscrupulous steel and ammunition manufacturers *et al,* would not carry the day by the tremendous resources they could wield.

However, let it be not forgotten that always, in any population, there is a tremendous inertia, or social lag. No mass of individuals reacts favorably at once to an upheaval, or likes to have its habitual procedure uprooted. At present, a war-bent government can profit from this fact by going ahead with its war program, counting on the sluggishness of the masses not to oppose it in time.

Coming before the people with a war proposal, any government would be in a very different position. It would be likely to encounter a strong reluctance. It was not until the boys were actually in camp that the reluctant groups of American parents were won whole-heartedly to our overseas crusade in 1917. One great thing would be accomplished in large measure by the existence of a war referendum: the ever-vast public inertia would be transferred from the credit to the debit side of the war ledger. And the chance of that alone, to say nothing of democratic justice, makes the proposal sound and worthy of effort.

Again, however, we must not overlook the resentment which

has accumulated over war's undemocratic tyranny in the hearts of many a previous generation. While war is at all a threat, it will be a simple thing for governments everywhere to appeal successfully against the adoption of any such scheme. Each will declare it practicable only when all nations jointly put it into practice; and before any such unanimity can be expected, a far more drastic blow must be struck at the whole war system, a blow capable of rousing the attention of the masses as no undramatic referendum project ever can.

Redefining Patriotism

So heavily charged with emotion is the word "patriotism," so utterly irrational is all ordinary discussion of it, that most of those who realize how great a menace it may become even to the nations most effervescently patriotic, seldom venture to criticize the term. They take recourse, rather, in a more academic and less explosive word—the word "nationalism." Thus an internationalist can analyze nationalism and live to tell the story; but woe be to that individual who undertakes in public to scrutinize the idea of patriotism with anything remotely resembling scientific detachment. And yet for all practical purposes, irrespective of meticulous differentiations, nationalism and patriotism are in our day one and the same.[5]

Of nationalism we have outspoken critics, almost every last one of whom accompanies his strictures by loud protestations of his unassailable patriotism.

Others, recognizing that love of country is not without its socially useful manifestations, seek to redefine patriotism. According to this effort, patriotism is conceived of as a love for the highest welfare of your country's people. Thus articles are written on "The Patriotism of Peace." Thus one of the wisest leaders of thought among the Quakers is led to say:

> Friends are patriotic and loyal not to the wrong but to the right. They recognize that men of every race and creed are their fellowmen. Love of country does not imply hatred of enemies. The flag is loved not because it excludes, but because it draws to higher and better things.

Thus a conference of pacifist churches in 1928 decided that

> What is needed is that patriotism should be given a newer, fuller meaning. Material on the better patriotism is needed and we should try to make it available.

All this appears to my judgment as an untenable position. Let us take an illustration. It is much like saying that all religious people are going to be loyal to the Bible, when the Bible contains numerous flat contradictions. To be loyal to the good in the Bible (that is, what the individual himself considers good) means also, of course, being disloyal to the bad. Fundamentalists and modernists alike have asserted on innumerable occasions their fidelity to Scripture; loyalty to the "right" in the Bible has driven many to the stake—the "right" as the martyrs saw it, and the "right" according to their conscientious persecutors. Loyalty to the Bible has driven many literal pacifists into dungeons, while it impelled Charles Kingsley to write his *Brave Words to Brave Soldiers and Sailors,* in which he said:

> The Lord is not only the Prince of Peace; He is the Prince of War too; He is the great Master and the God of Battles, and whosoever fights in a just war against the tyrants and oppressors he is fighting on Christ's side and Christ is fighting on his side; Christ is his keeper and He is his mainstay, and he can be in no better service. Be sure of it; for the Bible tells you so.[6]

This species of patriotic pluralism, as it were, may be an excellent thing in theory—a *laissez faire* go-as-you-please. But in practice it is not workable simply because the *patria* will not let it be worked. When nothing which a government deems of crucial importance is at stake, citizens of a country may be granted a certain liberty of definition; but not in regard to anything of national import. In times of critical values to posterity, when great issues are involved, governments define patriotism and define it with a vengeance.

In terms of international relations, patriotism is the sanction which gives force to that anarchic "individualism" in the family of nations technically called "sovereignty." According to

Edmunds' *Lawless Law of Nations,* the term sovereignty was originated in 1577 by Jean Bodin in his work *De la Republique,* to furnish an "alibi" for the French absolutism which Louis XI had inaugurated in the preceding century. It was defined as "Supreme power over citizens and subjects, unrestrained by the laws." Grotius worked it into the law of nations, to designate the irresponsible and unlimited power of the State not only in national but in international relations. Patriotism: my country, right or wrong. Sovereignty: my country's right *to* wrong.

In international relations, a definite weakening of sovereignty is perhaps the most needed emotional change on the part of the world's peoples. But such a change must wait upon deeper-lying transformations within national frontiers. What is needed there, to speak bluntly, is a weakening of patriotism, a dilution of loyalty to fatherland by love of the larger human family: "Above all nations is humanity."

Not a one-hundred-per-cent, but a "fifty-fifty" patriotism, in short, is the emotional basis for which there is an imperative need. Not a redefining, but a wider distribution, of loyalties. What is required is precisely that which will be deplored and shrieked about by the more volatile superpatriots. Not those who shrink from internationalism in patriotic timidity, but those who have "a passion for the planet" [7]—these are the ones who lead us toward the promised land of world-wide friendship, freed from arbitrary reservations.

It is possible to love your country with undiminished ardor and still love the whole world with a passion for humanity; but only when there exists a community of interests and not a conflict of interests. Is it possible that the strong flame of patriotic devotion is somewhat responsible for the conflicts of interests that exist? I have no doubt about it. Interests may diverge, but they conflict only when they are evaluated by the traditional test of patriotism. Since there is little chance of resolving all the differences in national interest, the obvious need is for an internationalization of emotion, a transference of loyalty to a wider field.

The peace movement at times has had its far-sighted inter-

nationalists. In the *Rhode Island American,* in 1818, appeared the following "Lines Addressed to the Rhode Island Peace Society on Their First Anniversary":

> Ye Friends of Man, whom nobler zeal inspires
> Than laurel'd chiefs, or wary statesmen, fires;
> Whose gen'rous aim embraces, unconfin'd,
> Not *friend* and *country,* but entire *Mankind.*

Garrison's *Liberator* bore the famous slogan, "My country is the world; my countrymen are all mankind." William Ladd even grew so bold of utterance soon after his arrival at a radical pacifist view that he put his convictions into print.

> Patriotism as it is generally understood, is in direct opposition to Christianity. One is founded on self-love; the other on the love of God's creatures. Patriotism prefers the good of our country to the good of the whole human race. It approves of injustice to another country, when that injustice promotes the interests of our own. But the man, who would lie, deceive, rob, or murder, for the sake of his country, is no better than he who would commit all these crimes, for his own individual interest. For patriotism, as it is usually practiced is but an extended selfishness, and is as much inferior to philanthropy, as a narrow, clownish spirit, which loves none but its own party, or its own friends and relations, is to the most expanded patriotism. He, who prefers the interest of a part of mankind to the interest of the whole—the interest of his own nation to that of the world in general—though he may come up to the highest mark of patriotism, falls far below the lowest grade of Christianity.[8]

Some of the moderns are also speaking out. Raymond B. Fosdick, for example, in his book *The Old Savage and the New Civilization,* goes straight to the point in dispute:

> What is this thing we call patriotism? Once a sacred flame upon the altar, it has grown into a conflagration of devastating proportions. Once a noble passion that broke down local provincialisms and stretched the mind to broader loyalties, today, with the expansion of international life, its tendency is to narrow rather than widen the sympathies of man. Once the issue was patriotism versus a small parochialism; now the issue is between patriotism and the enlarging fellowship of human life on the planet.

Such forthright speech is rare, however. For so great has

been the emotional pressure, so eager to serve their fellow countrymen unselfishly in other ways than by war have been even the most radical members of the peace movement, that they have been extremely loath to take a position certain to bring upon them all sorts of outraged maledictions.

Not thus deterred, however, have been the military interests, whose patriotism is mistakenly conceived of as unassailable. Between the military leaders of all countries exists in all periods an extraordinary professional camaraderie. After a war, successful generals invariably make world tours, and are received everywhere with great acclaim, sometimes even in the countries of their erstwhile enemies. It is a customary courtesy to permit foreign officers from neutral countries to witness military operations: our officers so observed tactics and strategy in the Crimea and during the Franco-Prussian War. A few nationals of other countries are regularly trained in our government military schools. For instance, permission was granted in 1927 for the matriculation at West Point of two Siamese subjects and two Chinese subjects; and students of other nationalities have studied military tactics under our fraternal hospitality. We send military missions to other countries to assist them to formulate training policies.

Every naval vessel of the United States is supposed to carry the flag of every country in the world, for ceremonial purposes.

In the Old World, the intermarriage of royalty has never seemed a matter of diluted patriotism, excepting as it was a sacrifice to diplomatic pressure.

Immediately the World War was ended, French naval officers justified the German submarine campaign and Lord Fisher in England wrote Von Tirpitz that he did not blame him, for England, could she have done so and were she in a similar position, would have acted precisely the same.

Von Bülow, the German Chancellor, also wrote to the Kaiser, about Roosevelt, Sr., "the President is a great admirer of Your Majesty and would like to rule the world hand in hand with Your Majesty, since he considers himself in a way the American counterpart of Your Majesty," whereupon Wilhelm

II wrote upon the margin, "Very flattering to me!" [9] A libelous misconstruction of Roosevelt's ideas? Very likely; but not without a certain warrant. For in 1904, according to the records of Von Sternburg, the German Ambassador, President Roosevelt had said to him, "The only man I understand and who understands me is the Kaiser." [10]

Prior to the World War, Krupps numbered many nations among their clients. A dozen years before the War German contractors built the fortifications in Belgium which later they had to smash. Cannon made by Armstrong's in England were captured from the Turks on Gallipoli, one of them finding a resting place on the green at Bedford Park. On one side of this gun is an inscription regarding the gallant deed of the Bedford regiment and on the other side is the inscription, "Armstrong, Witworth and Company." [11]

The end of the World War did not mean the end of armament rings or the international control of munition manufacture. A union of American firms with British to buy heavily into central European companies was announced within a few years after the Armistice, and even the Skoda works of Czechoslovakia, a state-owned plant, have exported war materials to other countries. It is the inevitable outcome of the munition business to sell where customers want to buy, and where trade is sluggish, to drum it up. As A. Fenner Brockway, M.P., has aptly called it in his little play, it is indeed "The Devil's Business."

Patriotism is all things to all men. It is not only the last refuge of scoundrels as Samuel Johnson said, but is frequently the first.

It is used to make money, as witness the poultry food advertised during the War in red-white-and-blue "literature"; the use of the colors for store sales and movie extravaganzas; and such slogans as once shone forth in electric signs: "Be patriotic —drink ——'s" (beer).

It is used to bulwark economic orthodoxy, as evidenced by a conservative magazine which stated in 1920 that "you cannot indeed be a good American, in the sense of being loyal to

American traditions, unless you are proud of the capitalist system." [12]

In time of war its excesses are beyond recording, varying all the way from the committee, in an Ohio town, which forced German fried potatoes off the local menus, or the organization of Unconditional Surrender Clubs, as in Flint, Michigan, to recruiting verse, like the one appended to "Are you a good sport? Enlist in the Navy and go hunting for U-boats":

HUNT THE HUN DUCK

(Sing to the tune of "Hold the Fort")
Shoot the Hun duck,
  Send it skidding,
Down among the whales.
  Hit the Hun duck in its gizzard,
Punch! until it fails.

Or there is General George H. Harries, who still had so much steam up thirteen months after the World War ended as to regret openly, with alarm and sadness at Summit, New Jersey (and, incidentally, in a church), that there was no Allied blunder equal to the signing of the Armistice.[13]

Patriotism, too, has lifted out of a self-centered existence many an individual and moved him to think unselfishly for the first time in his life. It has opened tight purses, and stirred young men to offer themselves for what in all honesty they have accepted as just and necessary conflict.

It has become to many people a *bona fide* religion, with the flag as an ikon and the flash of a bayonet on its way through human ribs as a counterpart of the cross.

All in all, it serves to hold back peace and the dawn of a world society. In the resounding words of H. G. Wells,

> We regard our country as something primary and eternal. We must never think of it subordinated nor imagine that its separateness can end.
>
> It is to go on for all time just as it is, only more so. The rest of the world may go to the devil. If patriotism is not all that, then what is patriotism?
>
> Now, I maintain that in this matter you cannot run with the

hare and hunt with the hounds. You cannot be an advocate of organized world peace and a full and complete patriot also. A great number of worthy people are trying to achieve this impossibility.

If we subtract them from the total of those who are "working for world peace," I doubt if any large number of people remain.[14]

Wells' mathematics is probably correct. But if those who remain are small in numbers, they are nevertheless the ones who, in the vanguard, are moving out of old compromises and academic, unsound "redefinitions," toward a day when Man will be Man's earthly first and sacrosanct allegiance.

On what psychological factors does one-hundred-per-cent patriotism fatten? On many, of course. But at the root of them all is one central influence that seems strangely overlooked. It is not so much that excessive patriotism is a cause of war, as it is that war is a major cause of patriotic inflation, always most in evidence after every conflict but lingering for many years. An amusing example of how persistent war's traditions are is the repeated shelving of a bill for the discontinuance of State appropriations to a Virginia military school, as recommended by an educational survey commission of eleven well-known Virginians on the ground that it devotes too much time to military affairs. Reason? In part at least, because the school is a long-revered State institution, since its cadets distinguished themselves in the Civil War and a great general was a member of its faculty.[15] One can sympathetically understand the traditional Virginian; for several years the writer's whole outlook on war and peace was influenced by a pocket-piece, given me by a sweet-spirited old veteran, made of cannon captured in the same sectional strife.

The best way to deflate patriotism from menacing proportions to a useful social force is, above all others, I submit, to abolish war, thus eliminating the invariable hangover of false reverence, "pooled self-esteem," and identification of love of country with veneration for all the manifestations of militarism.

Until war is prevented and kept prevented for a long time,

all the arguments against inflammatory superpatriotism merely dampen the flying sparks; they do not put out the fire that smolders always and periodically breaks out with its devastating flames.

Peace by Prizes

If not an argument precisely, one method of stirring public opinion against war is the peace prize. And such prizes have been offered partly in the hope of discovering an argument that will be persuasively effective.

The practice is by no means new. As far back as 1766 an anonymous donor offered through the French Academy a prize for the best anti-war treatise received. Writers in several countries entered the competition, and at least three important essays were written as a result, while others followed in the years succeeding.

The span of years from Nemo to Bok is sprinkled with more or less generous showers of prize money. In the 'thirties a member of the American Peace Society offered a hundred dollars for the best tract on "the duty of Christians, to do what they can to abolish the custom of war," provided the American Tract Society should adopt the tract as one of their own! Ladd gave to several colleges two hundred dollars, the income from which, twelve dollars, was given for the best annual essays on subjects, given out by the donor, on peace and war. Similar twelve-dollar prizes soon were offered through other institutions, such as Newton Theological Institute and the theological seminaries at Andover and Bangor, principally by the gifts of the Reverend Howard Malcolm.

In 1853 the Reverend Thomas Merrill, a Vice President of the American Peace Society, offered five hundred dollars for the best essay on "The Right Way, or the Gospel Applied to the Intercourse of Individuals and Nations."

In Europe, prizes were also being offered: at Geneva, for the best essay in French on the Means for Establishing a General and Permanent Peace; another at London, of one hundred guineas for the same general theme.

When Charles Sumner made his will, it included a bequest of one thousand dollars to Harvard University for the best essay on methods, other than war, for the settlement of international differences. This fund has not been used to the full and since only one prize of one hundred dollars appears to have been offered each year, it has mounted up to more than eight thousand five hundred dollars.[16]

At the annual meetings of the Universal Peace Union held in their famous grove at Mystic, Connecticut, prizes were offered for peace recitations by children, the chief prize usually consisting of an India proof engraving of Penn's treaty with the Indians; just as Mr. Clement Biddle recently has donated one thousand dollars for similar contests.

Many minor prizes were offered through the nineteen-eighties and 'nineties, such as a ten-dollar prize for arbitration essays at Bowdoin, and one at Maine Wesleyan Seminary.

The American Peace Society in 1893 announced three prizes of one hundred dollars, fifty dollars, and twenty-five dollars, respectively, for the best essays by college students, on one or another aspect of peace.

Other well-known prizes were the Pugsley Prize of one hundred dollars offered through the Mohonk Conferences by Chester D. Pugsley in 1908 and successive years, and the prizes of two hundred dollars and one hundred dollars donated by Mrs. Elmer Black for women students writing on peace or arbitration.

For many years the prizes offered by the Misses Mary and Helen Seabury through the American School Peace League have stimulated thousands of normal and secondary school pupils to write on peace.

Prior to the Church Peace Union's endorsement of our entry into the World War, it offered a prize of one thousand dollars for the best peace essay, which was won by Dr. Washington Gladden's "The Forks of the Road."

One of the most lively experiences with prize contests was that of the American Peace Society in 1829 and the following eleven years. Always interested in a Congress of Nations, the Society at its first annual meeting offered a prize of

thirty dollars for the best essay on that subject. No essays were forthcoming. The amount was increased to fifty dollars, but of the four or five essays resulting not one was of any serious value. In 1831, two members of the Society (a Mr. Batchelor and the Society's treasurer, L. D. Dewey in all probability) proffered five hundred dollars for the same purpose. Forty essays were entered in the contest. A distinguished committee of award, composed of Joseph Story, William Wirt and John McLean, were unable to pick a single outstanding essay among five which they deemed worthy, and suggested a division of the prize, whereupon the donors refused to accede. They extended the time another year, raised the prize to one thousand dollars and selected a new committee made up of John Quincy Adams, James Kent (the noted Supreme Court Justice of New York State) and Thomas S. Grimké, the radical pacifist of South Carolina, though on the death of Grimké in the ensuing year Daniel Webster agreed to serve as the third member.

Surely this jury of eminence could have been expected to render a satisfying verdict! And yet they, too, had to deal with substantially the same essays, since only one new one was offered during the entire year; and their conclusion was almost the same as that of their (less) esteemed predecessors. The donors pleaded vainly for a first choice, but the committee was adamant, whereupon the gentlemen who held the money bag again refused to give any prize at all and declared the contest off, leaving everybody disgruntled and some essays of significance and merit buried beneath the wreckage.

For a time even the patient and resourceful Ladd was stumped, and as he put it, the Society was left "in a very awkward predicament." Up and down he went, soliciting subscriptions for a volume containing the five essays that seemed best to his judgment, plus his own composite essay. His faithful labor, and his own pecuniary generosity also, were rewarded if belatedly by the publication—though not until 1840 and only one year before his death—of the large volume of *Prize Essays* which has been referred to in an earlier chapter.

A quarter of a century has passed since the Nobel Peace

Prize provided an opportunity for gambling, should anyone care to do it, more ruled by sheer chance than any race course in the world. Some of its winners have been celebrated for their militarism. There have been deserved awards, such as the honoring of Bertha von Suttner in 1905, Alfred H. Fried in 1911, Premier Branting of Sweden in 1921, and M. Buisson and Herr Quidde in 1927; but while other recipients of the award have been highly estimable figures, few have been more than fair-weather pacifists and some have been notorious apologists for peace-via-war—Roosevelt, Root (a former Secretary of War), Wilson and Dawes, not to mention those of other countries.

Since the World War much attention has been attracted by the Filene peace prizes offered in Europe, the prize of twenty-five thousand dollars offered through the National Education Association by Raphael Herman and won by David Starr Jordan, and preëminently the fifty thousand dollars offered by Edward Bok, won by the late Charles H. Levermore.

As a means of advertising peace in a vague and hazy way to the general public, such prizes have a distinctly practical use. Of undeniable value and influence have been the Seabury prizes, for their effect in vitalizing the interest of countless young people in peace, year after year. A new and somewhat similar prize essay contest has been launched as the Zelah Van Loan World Friendship Award, offering fifteen hundred dollars in prizes to young writers on "Christ and World Friendship."

The fact is interesting and significant that 22,165 plans complying with all conditions were sent in to Mr. Bok's committee of award and that many thousands were submitted which in some way violated the rules.

As a technique of finding practical approaches to peace, however, they amount substantially to zero. That plan is always bound to be accepted which represents the greatest common denominator of the award committee; and the committee is uniformly composed of people influenced by commitments to peace projects as well as by factual knowledge. Quite apart also from

any inability of a highly important body of citizens to shape the prize undertakings to realities is the fact that plenty of excellent peace plans have existed and still exist, and that what is lacking is not so much intellectual ideas as emotional drive, willingness to sacrifice rights, courage to run the risks of peace instead of war, and in particular, to guide the development of national policies by altruistic criteria. From her storied abode the angel of peace broods over the earth with questioning eyes; she is not only asking "How?" or "What?" but "When?"

A real boon to humanity would be a plan that is deserving of the highest prize of all, namely world peace. Any such plan for the United States will be obliged to deal less with machinery and organization, however, than with interests and policies. It will have to answer certain problems, of which I venture to suggest the following as samples. It must:

1. Throw into productive employment a vast number of war strategists, navy boosters, and ammunition manufacturers, without losing the vote of American patrioteers.

2. Lift from our taxpayers the burden of spending eighteen per cent of our national budget on current preparedness, and at the same time retain armed forces on land and sea sufficient to cope with any conceivable adversary.

3. Provide for the free international exchange of goods without giving up high protection for American industries.

4. Safeguard our right to penetrate any part of the world for the increase of our prosperity, without being obliged to weaken our one-hundred-per-cent American citizenry by the admission of foreigners—except in such quantities as will also increase our prosperity.

5. Carry on the War settlements with a spirit of benevolent neutrality in the manner relied on hitherto—for example, our fair-minded desire to see Germany pay no more than she can and the Allies collect all that they want and all that we can take.

6. Open to our indignation all such encroachments on the rights of small nations as that of Italy on Corfu, without depriving us of the right to maintain order in the Caribbean.

7. Allow Soviet Russia to take her place among respectable

nations in such a way that her communism, which has prostrated her, cannot possibly make her so strong as to endanger the capitalism of other nations.

8. Work out a *modus operandi* whereby the nations may associate in true democratic fellowship, but which will render large countries like the United States immune to the international idealism of smaller ones.

9. Devise a technique of open diplomacy that will enable diplomats to make international adjustments without the risk of popular unrest.

10. Instill into the youth of the world a hatred of war without depriving them of the benefits of military discipline, target practice, bayonet drill, and the spirit of "for Yale, for Country and for God."

11. Repair the damage done by our entry into the World War and our attitude toward the peace, without forcing us to admit, even to ourselves, that the results of American participation were anything but good.

12. Organize the intellectual classes for a complete repudiation of war in general, yet in no way committing them to an opposition to any—and every—war in particular.

13. Elevate into international ethics the principles of the Sermon on the Mount without embarrassing in any degree the thousands of clergymen who have proved that Christianity and war are compatible.

14. Follow the peace leadership of other nations in such a way as to preserve our supremacy in the struggle against war.

Now *there* are fourteen points! Let me hasten to state with the utmost gravity that I have never sought a peace prize or a job with any foundation, that I have neither ax to grind nor sour grapes to squeeze. I do assert, however, with becoming modesty, that when peace plans more worthy of a prize are offered I may on that day try. For if such schemes are nonproductive in raising impenetrable barriers against the hounds of war, so, certainly, have been all others in the archives of Time, the greatest historian of them all.

Also an argument only indirectly, but nevertheless a recurring

focal point of pleas against war, is the suggestion of a Cabinet portfolio for peace. Doubtless the most carefully worked-out proposal of this nature, with a tentative budget outline, is that of Kirby Page, published in 1926. Since then, the same suggestion has cropped up intermittently in Friends' and other journals. Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt recently said:

> My solution of the disarmament question is to proceed by a movement to build up a peace institution that will be positive not negative. . . . Put the peace institution under the Department of State and develop that Department into an active power for peace.[17]

Dr. David Starr Jordan has spoken to the same end, as have numerous others. Miss Agnes C. Macphail, a member of Canada's House of Commons, introduced a resolution on March 26, 1928 for a Canadian Peace Department, though it met the usual reception faced in most legislative bodies by peace proposals.

But as far back as 1790 Dr. Benjamin Rush put forward an elaborate scheme for a Peace Department. Rush was a figure renowned in the annals of medicine, of war, and of public service generally. He was a signer of the Declaration of Independence. Here is the Rush project in brief:

> Art. 1st. Let a Secretary of the Peace be appointed to preside at this office, who shall be perfectly free from all the present absurd and vulgar European prejudices on the subject of government: Let him be a genuine republican and a sincere Christian, for the principles of republicanism and Christianity are no less friendly to universal and perpetual peace than they are to universal and equal liberty.
>
> Art. 2nd. Provides for the maintenance of free schools and the principles of the Christian religion, for it belongs to this religion exclusively to teach us, not only to cultivate peace with all men, but to forgive, nay more, to love our enemies.
>
> Art. 3rd. Provides for the free distribution of the Bible at public expense.
>
> Art. 4th. Let the following sentence be inscribed, in letters of gold, over the doors of every State and Court house in the United States: "The Son of Man came not into the world to destroy men's lives, but to save them."
>
> Art. 5th. Provides for the repeal of sanguinary laws.

Art. 6th. To subdue the passion of war, which education, added to human depravity, have made universal, a familiarity with the instruments of death, as all military shows, should be carefully avoided. For which reason, military laws should everywhere be repealed, and military dresses and titles should be laid aside.

What more could be asked by advocates of drastic disarmament? In part Dr. Rush was driving at the same objective as the Women's Peace Union, for example, which succeeded in persuading Senator Lynn J. Frazier to introduce his Amendment to the Constitution, on which two hearings have been held, in 1927 and 1930—a most thorough Amendment designed to put Mars out of business, cremate him, and scatter his ashes to the winds.

Symbolism, too, lured Dr. Rush to elaborate flights of decoration:

Art. 7th. In the last place: let a large room, adjoining the federal hall be appropriated for transacting the business and preserving all the records of this office. Over the door of this room let there be a sign, on which the figure of a lamb, a dove, and an olive branch should be painted, together with the following inscription, in letters of gold: "Peace on Earth—Good Will to Men. Ah, why will men forget that they are brothers?"

One answer to this rather agonized inquiry, perhaps, may repose in the penumbra of the fact that spokesmen for peace have so long either bleated like lambs, cooed like doves, or quivered vernally against the harsh and wintry gales of war.

But there was a gusto about good Dr. Rush. He had a corollary to his first proposal. It is worth inserting, as a bouquet for the galaxy of war promoters whose ministrations are never absent from the land.

In order the more deeply to affect the minds of the citizens of the United States with the blessings of peace, by contrasting them with the evils of war, let the following inscriptions be painted on the sign which is placed over the door of the war offices:—

1. An office for butchering the human species.
2. A widow and orphan making office.
3. A broken bone making office.
4. A wooden leg making office.

5. An office for creating private and public vices.
6. An office for creating public debt.
7. An office for creating speculators, stock jobbers and bankrupts.
8. An office for creating famine.
9. An office for creating political diseases.
10. An office for creating poverty and the destruction of liberty and National happiness.

In the lobby of this office let there be painted representations of all the common military instruments of death; also human skulls, broken bones, unburied and putrefying dead bodies, hospitals crowded with sick and wounded soldiers, villages on fire, mothers in besieged towns, eating the flesh of their children, ships sinking in the ocean, rivers dyed with blood, and extensive plains without tree or fence, or any other object but the ruins of deserted farm houses. Above all this group of woful figures, let the following words be inserted in red characters, to represent human blood:— "NATIONAL GLORY."

Ere the hand of the National Security League, Military Order of the World War, American Defense Society, D.A.R., Better America Federation, Scabbard and Blade, National Civic Federation, Industrial Defense Association, or some other watchdog of the public weal, descends heavily on my shoulder and I am loudly rebuked, let me hasten to remind all and sundry that I never said these words, never thought them, and, being a child of our modern age imbued with restraint of utterance, should never have spoken them had I been their fond inventor. The honors, and in my opinion they are not inconsiderable, should go to Dr. Rush, American citizen, born December 24, 1745, graduate of Princeton, original Signer, and experienced in war as a surgeon to a part of the army in 1776. And so what can be done to put him in his place to-day must be left to our ingenious national salvationists.

A year or two after Dr. Rush brought forward his plan, or so it would appear by circumstantial evidence, Benjamin Banneker, a free Negro, published in his *Almanac* a very similar peace plea. Banneker had won attention by his development, self-taught, into an amateur astronomer and mathematician, a marvelous achievement to people not yet weaned of their no-

tions concerning the Negro's mental inferiority. His project follows that of Rush's point by point; but the wording is somewhat different, and from a literary standpoint far less effective. While it has been suggested in some quarters that Benjamin Banneker may have been America's first pacifist, there is strong internal evidence that he copied the Rush plan and adapted it to suit himself. In outlining to President Jefferson, for example, the ideas to which he was devoted, he was detailed and specific, but nowhere in his letter does he mention peace as laying any serious claim upon him. The early writers on peace, all of them eager to seize upon any accomplishment by Negroes, agree in attributing the plan and the outspokenness with which it was presented, alike to the more eminent Benjamin.

Now and then, in succeeding years, the plan of Dr. Rush's was resurrected by the peace movement, but never wholeheartedly pressed. After the Civil War there were occasional revivals, initiated by individual peace workers. After the Spanish-American War, John Hay, Secretary of State, hospitably entertained a delegation from the Universal Peace Union, which laid special stress on a Department of Peace in their discussion. When the Department of Commerce and Labor was inaugurated in 1903 (separated in 1913) the pleas for a Bureau of Peace in connection with it rose strongly for a brief period. In 1909 and for a short while following, President Taft's Department of State had an under-secretary for peace. The Conference on the Cause and Cure of War, in 1925, called for the restoration of such an official.

At one time, before his appointment to President Wilson's cabinet, William Jennings Bryan expressed himself in favor of such a federal department. Admiral Goodrich, after the War with Spain, suggested a Department of Education and in connection with it a Department of Peace.

In December, 1926, at Atascadera, California, there was organized the American Association for World Peace, with a membership of seventy persons, whose object was "to create a Nation-wide demand that Congress enact a law establishing the office of Secretary of Peace, with portfolio in the Cabinet, and setting aside all funds derived from our Allied war loans

to be used under his direction to educate and prepare the world for Peace."

Nevertheless, the idea of a federal peace department has never caught hold of the peace movement's imagination. And why? On the face of it nothing could seem more logical.

Thoughtful analysis, however, relates such a move directly to the state of politics in the United States of America. Any appointee of any government we are likely to get while there exists so uncrystallized a sentiment for the prevention of war, and so little determination to abolish war as a social menace, could merely broadcast, on a larger scale, war-peace ideas and projects of a thoroughly respectable, anæmic character. No real peace scheme involving the necessary sacrifices of traditional values could be anything but anathema to a government in the United States to-day. No leader of such projects could be other than *persona non grata* in the councils of Washington. No peace propaganda or peace education carried out by an official government agency can rise to greater heights than the government itself. And while our government continues to derive its sanction primarily from economic motives that are inimical to peace, peace policies fathered by bureaucrats can never rise to heights; we are lucky if only they do not sink to depths.

All this does not mean that the government is in the hands of wicked marplots, bent on war and not caring for peace. Men are only the instruments by which the trend of conviction (or, often, inertia) in a nation is registered on passing events. The nation and the government alike want peace; but are not ready to make the economic and psychological adjustments—and these are not minor—to insure it.

Furthermore, a Cabinet cannot exist—or, certainly, cannot function smoothly—half slave to war, half free for peace. So long as we retain the War and Navy Departments, the injection of a so-called Peace Department would present a situation of ludicrous incongruity. In fact a recent writer arguing for a Peace Department ends his article:

> And one incidental benefit would result as a very welcome by-product of the establishment of this department: it would make peace workers respectable, and remove from peace organizations

the stigma of failure in patriotism, and it might even be that the dove of peace would be allowed to appear in company with the eagle![18]

Is it conceivable that the Secretaries of War and of the Navy would modify their programs to adapt them to the Peace Department? Then would not the opposite inevitably result?

When the Department of Labor tolerates a Department of Idleness; when the Department of Commerce accepts as friend a Department for the Abolition of Trade; then, and then only, may we expect to see the Secretaries of War and of the Navy fall on the neck of a Secretary of Peace. Short of such a miracle, we may expect to see either an ineffective nonentity in a perfunctory portfolio, or the continuation of peace policies, when there are such, in the hands of the State Department, which does at least have an opportunity to coördinate its work in accord with actual policies, for better or for worse. If an honest-to-goodness Secretary for the Abolition of War ever wormed his way into a Cabinet under anything like present-day conditions, his rival Secretaries would indeed fall on his neck, but not in the precise manner narrated of such incidents in Holy Writ.

Peace through Education

If people were only cultured, well educated in general, peace would be assured. So runs one argument.

If they were let alone by the propaganda of militarism and were educated definitely for peace, war would speedily disappear. So runs another.

The first of these arguments was heard but little in the earlier days when education was the aim, and not the boast, of the American Commonwealth. But increasingly, in the years before the World War, it won adherents in the intellectual world. At the National Arbitration and Peace Congress of 1907, with Andrew Carnegie presiding, Sir Robert Cranston exclaimed:

I do not wish to be a sycophant to you or any other man in this country or in any other country, but I believe the way to obtain

peace has been taken by the man who occupies the chair tonight (applause); it is to build libraries, endow schools, erect colleges and try to permeate every man and woman with the higher ideals of life, then armaments will fall to pieces.

Seven years elapsed; and then began a battle of the scholars, the pedagogues, and the literati of the world, those in each nation striving to outlie and outhate their counterparts in enemy countries. In the United States, as *The New Republic* proclaimed:

> The effective and decisive work on behalf of war has been accomplished by . . . a class which must be comprehensively but loosely described as the "intellectuals."
>
> The American nation is entering this war under the influence of a moral verdict reached after the utmost deliberation by the more thoughtful members of the community. They gradually came to a decision that the attack made by Germany on the international order was sufficiently flagrant and dangerous to justify the country in abandoning its cherished isolation and in using its resources to bring about German defeat. But these thoughtful people were always a small minority. They were able to impose their will upon a reluctant or indifferent majority partly because the increasingly offensive nature of German military and diplomatic policy made plausible opposition to American participation very difficult, but still more because of the overwhelming preponderance of pro-Allies conviction in the intellectual life of the country. If the several important professional groups could have voted separately on the question of war and peace, the list of college professors would probably have yielded the largest majority in favor of war, except perhaps that contained in the Social Register. A fighting anti-German spirit was more general among physicians, lawyers, and clergymen than it was among business men—except those with Wall Street and banking connections.
>
> Finally, it was not less general among writers on magazines and in the newspapers. They popularized what the college professors had been thinking. Owing to this consensus of influences opposition to pro-Allies orthodoxy became intellectually somewhat disreputable, and when a final decision had to be made this factor counted with unprecedented and overwhelming force. College professors headed by a President who had himself been a college professor contributed more effectively to the decision in favor of warfare than did the farmers, the business men, or the politicians.[19]

As the War went on, these same "intellectuals" not only imposed on the public mind all the justifiable resentment against the German cause, but added to it a series of perversions of fact, as witness some of the wrenching of quotations from German scholars out of their context, practiced by scientists under the so-called Creel Bureau. In the name of liberalism they sought to wage war, the apotheosis of autocracy and illiberalism, democratically and with due regard to ideals. At first opposed to conscription, they soon reconciled themselves to it and before long backed it up cheerfully. And what a fanfare of tirade and mouth-frothing was indulged in by the master minds of American education and morality during that period is an open book, available, fortunately, in the public prints for all who can stomach the fetid record.

When the War for democracy and peace was over, the ex-college professor who had sought to win through to high ideals by base and self-defeating methods, still smarting, no more from his personal disability than from his defeats at Paris by the wily Clemenceau and by the secret deceits of his erstwhile allies, was moved to declare, wryly, "I should like to see Germany clean up France and I should like to meet Jusserand and tell him that to his face." [20]

Since those discreditable doings, little has been heard of the idea that education of itself can lead the peoples of the world toward peace. Never could there be a neater or a more tragic instance of the blind leading the blind.

There have been, however, so many discussions of education for peace, so many protests against the militarization of childhood, that it would be a gratuitous waste of effort to recount them here. The literature of the peace movement in all its differing shades of opinion abounds with them. Books have been written on the question, magazines have run articles about it, and educational as well as peace conferences have sometimes run on to great lengths in consideration of its various phases. Everyone cognizant of what is going on in the educational world understands the race between militarization of the youthful mind and the liberating concepts of world brotherhood.

No sooner had the country settled down to business as a constitutional nation, than the public schools became the vehicle for military propaganda. Pupils in New England were given Ignatius Thomson's little wooden-covered book, *The Patriot's Monitor, designed to impress and perpetuate the first principles of the revolution on the minds of youth.* Those principles, as stated, are deservedly inspiring; but the war method and the glorification of national sovereignty are of course taken for granted and efficiently rammed home.

On the other side was Noah Worcester, writing in 1820 that

> By information from various parts of the United States, we learn that strong desires have been expressed in favor of the general introduction of school books which may be adapted to imbue the minds of the young with a love of peace and an abhorrence of war. A more reasonable and important desire has seldom been expressed. Should it prevail, and its object be attained, durable benefits will unquestionably result.[21]

Alas, it was not then successful, any more than now. In 1832 the devout Thomas S. Grimké vigorously declaimed:

> Peace can never triumph, till education in all its departments, shall teach youth, that those which are called heroic virtues, are expressly prohibited by Christ both in precept and example; that the only warrior, if I may venture the term, whom Christ acknowledges, is the Martyr, laying down property, liberty and life, in his cause; but resolute not to bear arms in defence of them or in vindication of his master's rights. . . . I speak, therefore, the language of a faithful, enlightened friend of the people, when I declare that their highest good is not consulted, unless the *whole scheme* of education be in its elements, practice and influence, decidedly, unchangeably peaceful.[22]

William Ladd, among his first writings and speeches on peace, manifested a passionate interest in education. The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, campaigning in certain sections against military toys, never felt a deeper resentment than that shown by the Apostle of Peace, as expressed in the course of a passionate address:

> The course of education from infancy to manhood at present pursued, tends to inspire the mind with military ardor, and *a love*

of glory. Almost as soon as a boy is born, care is taken to give his mind a military turn. The first playthings given him are miniature guns, trumpets, and drums, with pewter soldiers and wooden swords. Ah, fond mother! little do you think, while you dress the forward urchin with the paper cap, and arm him with some mock instruments of death, and delight to see him march round your parlor to a military tune, affecting the manners of a soldier,—little do you think, that you are giving his tender mind a wrong direction, and making impressions which may last forever. . . . It is the duty of every mother, of every father, and of every instructor of youth, to educate children in a manner very different from the prevailing custom.

I greatly fear it would not be quite so simple a matter to turn this trick to-day. In the first place, we have—at least among progressive modern educators—something of a conscience about even our own propaganda when it comes to indoctrinating children. But from the above apostrophe, the most hard-boiled behaviorist and his psychological opposites—if there are any left—would agree on one revealing phrase: "little do you think." And they would agree also that the problem requires educationally a different approach from that of the straight-line moralist Ladd:

A distinguished instructor of youth told me his sons were so taken up with military notions, that he could not reason with them; and he asked me to talk to them. I took the oldest boy, aged about seven years, between my knees, and something like the following conversation ensued:—"Do you love to see the soldiers?" "Yes, I love to see the rub-a-dubs." "Would you like to be one yourself?" "Oh, yes!" "Well, but do you know what these soldiers are for?" "No." "Why, they are learning to kill people. Those bright guns are made to kill people with, and those bright bayonets to stab them with." The boy turned pale; such a thought never before entered his head. "Do you know who crucified our Lord, and drove the spiks through his hands and feet?" The boy was silent. "They were soldiers, and soldiers would burn *your* house, and cut down *your* fruit-trees, and kill your pa, if they were told to." Both the boys were astonished; tears stood in their eyes. "Do you want to be a soldier?" "No." "Do you want to see the rub-a-dubs?" "No."

Neither Ladd's methods nor Grimkés eloquence availed

much if anything at all. Military toys came in for their perennial criticism all through the succeeding years of alternating war and breathing spells. In 1901 the Honorable Andrew J. Palm, of the Pennsylvania State Legislature, was saying vociferously to the Universal Peace Union:

> Militarism is encouraged in the home when toy guns are furnished, thus cultivating the feeling which ultimately reaches a point which should cause a nation to blush with shame.

In 1903 there was general agreement when a speaker in a Philadelphia peace conference declared that our real peace work was with the children. Yet those very children were the ones conscripted and shipped overseas in 1917 and '18, and who now, as veterans, are often assiduously engaged in keeping alive in the public schools the tradition of war and faith in war as a method of solving international issues.

There is a common feeling that if the children of the various countries can be taught about each other in a spirit of good will, they will grow up to be less inclined toward any future war. Well and good; too much good will, even if somewhat abstract, can never be built up. Friendly imagination is a resistant to hatred.

But too much may easily be expected from this type of peace education. It is not so simple as put in some magazine verses:

> When children's friendships are world wide
> New ages will be glorified.
> Let child love child, and strife will cease,
> Disarm the hearts, for that is peace.

Nor is it true, as a writer has said in *The League of Nations News,* that "International understanding, like marriage, is largely a matter of propinquity." That is to say, even if it were true, understanding alone is not an adequate guarantee of peace. Mere propinquity is no sounder a basis for international peace than for marital bliss. Two of our major wars have been fought with the one people of the world nearest to us in language, blood, and institutions, and another great war even between different sections of our own people.

From abundant examples in present-day bookmaking, I select one child's book as a reminder of our failure to free children from war propaganda to-day. Instead of taking one from some reactionary source, however, I prefer to go to the Institute for Public Service, New York City. Its book bears no less imaginative a name than *Liberty the Giant Killer.* The date is 1919. The theme is World War heroism, for very youthful readers. Here is a portion of the foreword: "Need we say more?" We need to, but not much; merely that the rest of the book spreads the war mythology on thick in all its educational glorification.

There are just as many princesses to love, honor and protect in the world right now as there were in the "once upon a time" days. They are your Mothers, Sisters, Aunts, and Cousins. There are just as many Princes, too. They are Princes of the Everyday world called your Daddies and Brothers, Uncles and Cousins. They are the Princes who sailed three thousand miles across the sea to overcome an enemy that was more dangerous than the giants and dragons, witches and elves of the old fairy stories. For this enemy tried to conquer and rule the whole world, and tried to make men and women, boys and girls give up the freedom they love so dearly.

Now that enemy is beaten, and your Daddies, Brothers, Uncles and Cousins have come home. They will tell you stories more wonderful than any fairy story that was ever told or written. [May one not be pardoned for doubting it, with this example before him?] And if you read Liberty the Giant Killer, you will find other true stories about brave Belgian, French, British, Italian and American soldiers, who fought in the World War for everlasting liberty and everlasting peace.

Somehow the victory seems to have produced not liberty, but a multiplication of despotisms; not peace, but a more widespread militarism, for such good results as came out of the War were largely accidental. And yet, what does that signify? It was not the object that mattered. Had the war been any different, would the war supporters have rallied any less like zealots? It was the fighting that mattered, as it has always mattered, in every war in which this country has participated. And from each one we have emerged with an overwhelming ambition to prepare the children for another.

One example, also, of the process in the public schools—perhaps worse than the average; let us hope it is. Some eighty-eight thousand copies in a single edition of a pamphlet for the twenty-fifth annual program for Patriotic Exercises in Schools, were issued February 12, 1926, Grand Army Flag Day, for use among Rhode Island school children by the State Commissioner of Education. Says Walter E. Ranger, the Commissioner, in a special message opening the booklet:

To the boys and girls of Rhode Island schools:

When Lincoln called patriots forth sixty-four years ago, to save our country from disunion and our republic from ruin, there were some who opposed fighting even to defend the flag of our country and our national life. There were pacifists who would let the nation perish rather than make war; and among them lurked slackers, traitors and enemies of government by the people. . . .

There are some who in the cause of peace fear an excessive nationalism and decry patriotism as a cause of war. All true Americans believe that the prevention of all wars would be the supreme international blessing. But there are those who, hostile to American institutions, seek by pleas for peace to weaken our faith in them. Let us not be deceived by propaganda against national security in the name of peace. We recognize international duty but need to beware of the man who masks an attack on Americanism under a plea for internationalism, or who praises other peoples that he may belittle our nation. Pacific as we are, we may detect the treacherous taint in the solicitation of young children to pledge themselves never to obey their country's call if called to defend her by arms. Loyalty to country forbids such a pledge.

What are some of the things this commissioner would teach? If the things in the rest of the booklet are a reliable guide, here are some of them. There is a quotation from Edward Everett Hale's *The Man Without a Country,* which if followed would have silenced some of our now-worshiped leaders, even Lincoln, and certainly many in the historic peace societies:

If you are ever tempted to say a word or to do a thing that shall put a bar between you and your country, pray God in His mercy to take you that instant home to his own heaven.

He also cites excerpts from Henry Van Dyke's *True Americanism Is This,* one paragraph of which holds up the ideal that

To believe that for the existence and perpetuity of such a state a man should be willing to give his whole service, in property, in labor, and in life.

Which means, being translated, not to give life, but to take it in war. William Ladd and the other pioneers who labored for a better kind of peace education in schools, would hardly relish this tidbit from Mrs. Anthony Wayne Cook, former President General of the estimable D.A.R.:

We should see that our school boards are not allowing our public school systems to be used for the dissemination of propaganda which, in the guise of so-called peace literature, is in reality dangerous and insidious pacifist dogma.

As a matter of fact, too much this sort of thing has already been disseminated. It has been cleverly prepared so that it might insidiously stir up unrest and discontent in the minds of both pupils and teachers concerning our time-tested American governmental institutions.

Were it true that pacifists do seek to indoctrinate young minds with peace dogmas, the sin would be more terrible than the D.A.R., with its incessant military propaganda, could ever label it. But peace propaganda of the mildest form is only a pebble in the powder horn; it may cause some interruption in the smooth flow of nationalist war dogma, but that is all.

Henry Van Dyke figures again with his poem, *The Peaceful Warrior,* one stanza of which epigrammatizes:

A peaceful man must fight
For that which peace demands,—
Freedom and faith, honor and right,
Defend with heart and hands.

All of which leads naturally into a conclusion as true of this peace argument as of the others in this chapter and the one preceding. There is no use in seeking to pry militarism out of the school and the home, so long as wars themselves go on. War is no more a result of militaristic education than such education is the direct outcome of war.

Look over the specific ways in which the child mind is inculcated, unconsciously, with the gospel of the goosestep—the

toy weapons; the heroic tales; the revered veterans (and for their valor who can deny them homage?); the unforgotten dead; the memorials in stone, in cannon, in literature, in holidays; the paraphernalia of chauvinistic devotion to country, the salute to the flag, the war songs, the idealized national history. Any such analysis leads straight to the conviction that our protests for a hundred years gone by, and no less in this day but hit the slinking shadow of the unharmed wolf of war.

All True, and Yet——

These skirmishes are not valueless; we must press them without rest. But let us not deceive ourselves. They cannot make our homes safe refuges. They are based on an outworn strategy. They have not served to call out the best fighters to our banner; they have not kept war at bay. It is still marauding, and while it roams the world our pleas and protests are but voices flung to frighten it. They cannot slay it; yet it must be slain.

CHAPTER XIII

WOMEN IN THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

You want to know what was the most awful thing? The disillusionment was the most awful thing—the going off. The war wasn't. The war is what it has to be. Did it surprise you to find out that war is horrible? The only surprising thing was the going off. To find out that the women are horrible—that was the surprising thing. That they can smile and throw roses, that they can give up their men, their children, the boys they have put to bed a thousand times and pulled the covers over a thousand times, and petted and brought up to be men. That was the surprise! That they gave us up—that they sent us—sent us! . . . The women sent us. No general could have made us go if the women hadn't allowed us to be stacked on the trains, if they had screamed out that they would never look at us again if we turned into murderers.
—Wounded lieutenant, in *Men in War*, by ANDREAS LATZKO.
(Copyright, Boni and Liveright.)

CHAPTER XIII

WOMEN IN THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

Acid words are these of the Austrian World War veteran, bitter and certainly not wholly fair. But behind them lay centuries filled with feminine acclaim of war heroics.

Deborah, prophetess of Mount Ephraim, is exalted as the instigator of the conquering Barak of early Jewish lore.

It is recorded in a legend of Rome how the Sabine women, rather than see war between their avenging relatives and the Romans who had stolen them for wives, ran out between the armies and successfully averted conflict. But against this not altogether lovely tale must stand the Amazons of Greek legend, with their repute for effectiveness in slaughter.

The lion-hearted, martial Queen Boadicea of first century Britain has been dramatized by several poets and half a dozen playwrights.

Zenobia, queen of ancient Palmyra, led a tremendous military insurrection against the Roman Empire in the third century A.D.

Tacitus, in describing the special qualities of the Teuton barbarians, points out how their own women accompanied them into battle, nursing their wounds and cheering them on; and Justus Lipsius, his editor, added in 1575 the comment that they demanded, in their pride, that their loved ones should not return unwounded.

Among certain primitive tribes the torture of military prisoners has been a regularly assigned function of women, because of their demonstrated capacity for cruelty. Even as late as the French Revolution some of the men Terrorists were appalled and sickened by the ferocity of their women aides.

There are records of women, some of them courtesans,

some from the nobility, who served in early medieval armies—such as Margheritona of the light horse cavalry of the Count de Gaiazzo, and the noble swordswoman Luzia Stanga; these and others are mentioned by the Italian raconteur Bandello. Duels between women were surprisingly numerous, especially in France. The story of Saint Joan is too well known to need more than casual mention. In the eighth century the Duke of Bohemia was compelled to war against large bands of embattled women. Black Agnes, Countess of March, demonstrated warlike prowess in holding off a terrific siege of nineteen weeks against the Castle of Dunbar, led by the Earl of Salisbury in 1338. Mary Anne Talbot, an Englishwoman, in the latter part of the eighteenth century, won fame and a pension for her exploits as a drummer boy in Flanders Fields and for her bloody naval adventures. The Maid of Saragossa, celebrated by Lord Byron in his *Childe Harold,* is famous for her aid in the defense of the Spanish town in 1808. Even as recently as 1851, in France, the cross of the Legion of Honor was bestowed upon a woman—Angélique Duchemin—for three wounds sustained in the course of seven war campaigns. In the World War battalions of women fought at the front for Russia and Austria and perhaps for other countries.

At the very first glance [says Edward Beaumont, in his crotchety work, *The Sword and Womankind*] it is found that, dating from the best days of chivalry onwards, with all that was most distinguished among dashing, dainty dames, "great ladies a man sees at arquebus range," as the old Spaniards put it, the Sword had undisputed command of all advantages. Always fond and festive, always at lovemaking in times of leisure, always showing a gallant affectation of reckless gaiety and ease of manner, it represented in the eyes of women yet other telling and seductive qualities besides. It was an indispensable ally in their indulgences, giving a certain flavour of "high life" to their caprices, a surfeit of caresses after battles fought and victories won, presents from overseas and fresh news of the great outside world.

Now this is pretty hard. But it is scarcely sterner than the nettled words of the Reverend David Bogue in 1813:

The influence of the female sex is universally acknowledged and

felt. I want that influence to diffuse peace and love over the face of the earth. I scarcely know how to address myself to respectable matrons, who after nursing their sons with the tenderest affection send them away to the work of desolation, and rejoice at their success—when they make women like yourselves widows, and their children fatherless. . . . In which of your works have you come forth as the advocates of humanity and the champions of peace? Tell me, that I may withdraw the censure. You are silent: you blush at this reproach, and well you may: they may justly be the most burning blushes that ever reddened the female cheek.

Both the critics of women on this score, and their defenders, it seems, were given to a highly exaggerated notion of the influence of women in a state of society where they were all but universally considered, as Schopenhaur called them, "number two of the human species."

Noah Worcester paid them a glowing compliment:

Permit me then to express my firm belief, that the abolition of war will be completely in the power of the fair sex, if they can be persuaded to act the part of christians indeed, and to combine their influence for the heavenly purpose. . . . All women professing godliness should take a decided and active part. . . . By thirty years of faithful and united experience on the part of females in Christendom, war might lose all its fascinating charms, and be regarded by the next generation with more abhorrence than the people of the present age look back on the gladiatorial combats of Rome, the papal crusades, or the flames of martyrdom.

The Massachusetts Peace Society's third annual report developed the same fervent theme:

There is still another numerous and respected class of the human family, on whom great reliance may be placed—the CHRISTIAN LADIES. In former ages the influence of the fair sex was abundantly employed for sharpening the swords of ferocious men; and it is but a few centuries since the ladies of England were not ashamed to be seen at the publick tournaments, riding in troops with swords by their sides! But in this age the ladies set a noble example, by encouraging humane and beneficent institutions. A great accession of strength may therefore be expected from them, as soon as they shall have been duly apprised of the extensive influence which they may exert, for saving the lives of men and giving peace to the world.

Not only Worcester, but William Ladd as well, sought to apprise them duly. At Portland in 1824 he spoke directly to the feminine contingent of the Maine Peace Society:

> To gain your smiles we rush into the deadly conflict and destroy each other. Oh how melancholy is the fact, that female beauty, softness and delicacy should so often have smiled on scenes of carnage and bloodshed, and rewarded the perpetrators of the blackest crimes with smiles of approbation!

Said the opening broadside of the American Peace Society:

> We have one appeal left, which, should all others fail, we are sure will prove successful . . . and that, *ladies,* is addressed to you. . . . Plead for peace, for "who can plead like you?"

Ladd appealed to women to read peace literature, circulate it, assist in forming peace societies, and in 1835 issued his special work on *The Duty of Women to Promote the Cause of Peace.*

N. L. Foster, before the East Haddam (Connecticut) Peace Society (1825), struck the tonic chord when he exhorted:

> Ye venerable matrons! Ye mothers in Israel! Ye wives, ye daughters, ye sisters! It is you who control the stronger sex. It is you who sanctify and form man's dearest ties. Your influence is universally felt and acknowledged; you can make man a murderer, or a christian—an angel or a demon.[1]

The process of angelizing was earnestly tried—by some of the women among the handful reached by these pillars of prophecy. Ladd mentions the formation of "female peace societies" with approval, and helped by his presence to organize them, for example one in the Bowdoin Street Church of Boston. The Female Peace Society of Cincinnati was founded in 1820. Others exclusively for women followed, though never were they either numerous or influential. The Hartford (Connecticut) Peace Society in the 'forties had an unusually active female auxiliary.

In keeping with the temper of the period, women's work for peace was not such as to bring them conspicuously before the public eye. The Bowdoin Street society set out to "obtain in-

formation on the subject of Peace, to instruct children in the Sabbath school and at home in its principles, and to endeavor to carry out these principles in everyday life." It had required the passage of four years' time in the Massachusetts Peace Society before two women, Mrs. Sarah Blake and Mrs. Sarah Phipps, became the first representatives of their sex formally to join the peace movement. The American Peace Society encouraged ladies' societies in the churches to elect their pastors to life membership, at a cost of twenty dollars, the fee for non-ministers amounting to ten dollars more.

Peace Work—for Men Only

How widespread was the desire for this growing, if still subordinate, public activity of women? Most of the peace society leaders eagerly welcomed it; they were progressive in more ways than merely one. But by no means could all of them reconcile such incursions on their male prerogatives.

In the last years of the decade beginning with 1830 there was a widespread upheaval over self-assertive women pioneers. The Grimké sisters, Sarah and Angelina, whose brother Thomas had been so active an influence for peace until his death in 1834, had swung northward into the midst of the abolition crusade. Garrison and Samuel J. May (May very timidly at first) looked upon them with appreciative esteem. But hardly so the generality. As their audiences more and more came to include men as well as women, opposition to the innovators gathered force. That women were permitted to speak to mixed audiences under holy spires indicated to critics that "the abolitionists were ready to set at naught the order and decorum of the Christian Church." When the sisters spoke to enthusiastic congregations in the Unitarian Church at Hingham from the pulpit of the Reverend Charles Brooks—of whom we shall hear later as a leader in the fight against military training—the "Pauline prejudices" of many were dispelled.

Soon, however, came an attack in the form of an official bull (to use May's word) from the Pastoral Association of Massachusetts on "The Rights of Women." Nevertheless the

New England Anti-Slavery Convention held in Boston in May, 1838, voted (fulfilling the dire fears of the bachelor Whittier) that

> All persons present, or who may be present, at subsequent meetings, whether men or women, who agree with us in sentiment on the subject of slavery, be invited to become members and participate in the proceedings of the Convention.

The vote was five hundred and fifty-seven to four hundred and fifty-one. An irreconcilable minority of eight orthodox ministers resigned at once, and seven others, though remaining, filed a protest. Judge William Jay also left the Society, saying:

> Married women without their husbands were associated with men in the Executive Committee—a committee to which is confided the management of the society, and whose meetings have hitherto been and will probably continue to be, both frequent and private.

How slender a reed seemed marital loyalty in those regulated years! There were further committee complications. A committee of three, one of them a woman, was authorized to prepare a memorial for all the ecclesiastical associations of New England. It was received with boorish resentment generally, while the Rhode Island Congregational Association, even with the consent of clergymen who had been keen for abolition—under masculine auspices—unitedly voted

> to turn the illegitimate product from the house, and obliterate from the records all traces of its entrance.[2]

Over in London, two years later, an anti-slavery convention was also to bar women from its sessions, in obedience to "the plain teaching of the word of God."

So much for the character of the opposition to women in public life. It was no different when they desired to labor actively for peace. In Garrison's *Liberator* for December 15, 1837, the abolitionist leader announced that no longer could he be content with the emancipation of slaves alone. "Next to the overthrow of slavery," he declared editorially, "the

cause of PEACE will command our attention." The rest of the editorial is an exposition of non-resistance. Significantly, too, the utterance ended with these words:

> As our object is *universal* emancipation, to redeem woman as well as man from a servile to an equal condition,—we shall go for the RIGHTS OF WOMEN to their utmost extent.

Abolitionists, criticized widely for possessing only one idea, now had to endure still more condemnation for being all-around radicals and innovators. They recognized, however, the close connection between ends and means, and when a peace group met in Boston in May, under the chairmanship of William Ladd, and called a peace convention for the following September, they eagerly made plans to take part, seeing a chance to test the feminist issue in its relation to the peace movement along with their pacifist position.

The maneuvering of radicals and conservatives alike to swing this convention in their respective directions justifiably amuses the student of early tactics, and will be discussed later in some relevant detail. Not the last of the moot questions was the place of women in the meetings.

Women gamely attended, not knowing what their reception was to be. Garrison drove straight into the thick of the matter by suggesting immediately on the opening of the first session that slips of paper be passed around, for the registration of members, each individual to "sign his or her name." Garrison wrote about it to his wife:

> There was a smile on the countenances of many abolitionist friends, while others in the Convention looked very grave. Several of the clergy were present, but no one rose to object. Of course, women became members, and were thus entitled to speak and vote. A business committee was then appointed, upon which Abby Kelley and a Miss [Susan] Sisson were placed. Mrs. [Maria] Chapman was added to another committee. In the course of the forenoon, Reverend Mr. Beckwith [George C., of the American Peace Society] was called to order by Abby K. Endurance now passed its bounds on the part of the women-contemners, and accordingly several persons (clergymen and laymen) requested their names to be erased from the roll of the Convention, because

women were to be allowed to participate in the proceedings! They were gratified in their request.[8]

The *Liberator* lists seven of these angry dissenters; but the printed report of the proceedings shows a total of fourteen, among them several who had been strongly hopeful of women's influence in the eradication of war! Ladd was not among them; on another occasion he expressed the view (though it sounds resigned!), "Shut the gate in the face of woman and she will jump over the pickets. Open it wide and she will not be assuming."

The movement for women's emancipation was scarcely launched by the year of 1838. Susan B. Anthony was only eighteen years of age; Lucy Stone but twenty; Margaret Fuller twenty-eight; and Elizabeth Cady Stanton twenty-three, ten years younger than the first women's rights convention held in her home soon after the end of the Mexican War.

Though in that conflict Mexican women followed their men to the battlefields, where their ministrations to the wounded of both sides inspired Whittier's lines on "The Angels of Buena Vista," something of the fire of Revolutionary days seemed lacking in the reaction of women in the United States toward the piratical struggle across the arid southwestern border—though in their attitude toward the War there was nothing unique. They supported that War as they had the wars of earlier years. The capture of Tampico on November 14, 1846, was made possible largely through Mrs. Ann Chase, wife of the United States Consul, who supplied the invaders with plans of the city and other information.

As in most wars our own Revolutionary conflict drew into the fighting ranks a few combative women. Sarah Hull, wife of Major William Hull, went with him to camp and engaged in the famous Battle of Saratoga. In South Carolina, Grace and Rachel Martin put on their husbands' clothes, and in this convenient assumption of masculine prowess waylaid and took captive two British officers. At Fort Washington, Margaret Corbin fought shoulder to shoulder with her husband; when he was killed, she took over his labors in the artillery till she

received a wound, for which she later won Congressional praise. At Monmouth a gunner's wife did likewise, and for her act was awarded a commission. Hannah Weston at Machias, Maine, gathered powder, ball and foodstuffs for the town's male defenders, and thereby won a local immortality and twelve yards of "Camlet" cloth, the last of which was paid for by a grateful State. Deborah Sampson, who did not hesitate to aid in killing but was overcome with shame at being caught in male attire and at "man's work," served three years and twice was wounded. Every schoolgirl has heard of the exploits of Molly Pitcher.

As always, however, the vast majority of womankind aided in more conventional ways. In some localities—for example two counties in South Carolina—it became quite the fashion for young women to join in a pledge "not to receive the addresses of any suitors" who had not enlisted in the army.

In Philadelphia alone, in 1780, women gave up jewels and other valuables until a sum upwards of seventy-five hundred dollars was gathered to aid the "rebel" cause; more than twenty-two hundred shirts were made by them in the winter of that year. Long after the Revolution, when work on the Bunker Hill monument had twice ceased and a period from 1823 to 1840 had elapsed without the memorial shaft's completion, it was a group of women who supplied the funds and energy to finish it—the funds being earned by knitting needles and crochet hooks.

The abundant support of the war by women won them a tribute from the ever-gallant General Washington:

> The army ought not to regret its sacrifices or its sufferings, when they meet with so flattering a reward, as in the sympathy of your sex; nor can it fear that its interests will be neglected, when espoused by advocates as powerful as they are amiable.[4]

Elizabeth F. Ellet, in her book *The Women of the Revolution,* credits John Adams with a letter to his wife, in which he said:

> I believe the two Howes have not very great women for wives. If they had, we should suffer more from their exertions than we

do. This is our good fortune. A smart wife would have put Howe in possession of Philadelphia a long time ago.

The story of women in the War of 1812 is substantially the same as in the Revolution; though the later conflict happily produced a great many fewer Daughters.

Women and the Civil War

Mary A. Livermore, famous as feminist, Civil War worker, and who later joined in the labors of the peace societies and came to see much in socialism, published in 1887 a book about the Rebellion as she saw it. In that revealing work she says:

> The great uprising among men, who ignored party and politics, and forgot sect and trade, in the fervor of their quickened love of country, was paralleled by a similar uprising among women.[5]

Said a popular verse of the time:

> Just take your gun and go,
> For Ruth can drive the oxen, John,
> And I can use the hoe.

Thomas Buchanan Read urged Northern women on to loyal sacrifice:

> The wife who girds her husband's sword,
> 'Mid little ones who weep or wonder,
> And bravely speaks the cheering word,
> What though her heart be rent asunder,
> Doomed nightly in her dreams to hear
> The bolts of death around him rattle,
> Hath shed as sacred blood as e'er
> Was poured upon the field of battle.

A poet of the South did likewise, admonishing women to lay aside their bright gowns and gewgaws, and

> Come with your souls in your faces—
> To meet the stern needs of the hour. . . .
> E'en if you drop down unheeded
> What matter? God's ways are the best;
> You've poured out your life where 'twas needed,
> And He will take care of the rest.

They came, indeed, in 1861 just as they did in 1917. It was neither helmets nor sweaters that they sent to the troops, sometimes in embarrassing profusion, but the useless "havelocks," a headdress named in honor of the British General famed for his imperialist exploits in India. Delicacies were showered down, too often with a heartbreaking lack of facilities to transport them.

In North and South at one and the same time, women's fingers were busied with everything from letter-writing to tobacco bags. Those who recall the home life of early World War days, or of previous wars for that matter, will understand how these tobacco bags "were supposed to serve the same purpose as scalps in another kind of warfare. They marked, at least, the long roll of pleasant words and kindly glances, if not of incipient flirtations."

No less than their sisters of the North for one cause were the Southern women ready to sacrifice themselves for another. An appreciative Confederate veteran summed it up when he declared, after the War, that

> they were joined to the Southern cause to love, honor, and obey—for richer or for poorer, for better or for worse, and until death them should part!
>
> In a single word, the Southern women, old and young, gentle and simple, had but one thought, and that was to aid and encourage, in every conceivable way, the soldiers of the South.[6]

Not only in the sewing circles at home but at the front women were found in plenty. Mrs. Livermore states, of the Northern women, that

> The number of women who actually bore arms and served in the ranks during the war was greater than is supposed. Sometimes they followed the army as nurses, and divided their services between the battlefield and hospital.

There were Annie Etheridge, of Michigan, who fought in many battles all through the War; Bridget Devens, or "Michigan Bridget," who fought by the side of her husband till the War ended, and then enlisted with him in the regular army; Mrs. Kady Brownell, who served as color-bearer to the Fifth

Rhode Island Infantry, and earned fame as a skilled sharpshooter and swordswoman; Georgianna Peterman, drummer in the Seventh Wisconsin; and Madame Turchin, who not only nursed her husband when he was taken ill, but took his place at the head of his regiment—the Nineteenth Illinois. Mrs. Livermore quotes an unsubstantiated estimate of the number of women actually engaged in fighting for the North as nearly four hundred. Frank Moore, in his *Women of the War* (1866), tells the story of many more Civil War heroines whose exploits were varied, but equally colorful and demonstrative of women's ability to serve the state in the ancient masculine manner.

Yet it was through the Sanitary Commission, founded by Antoinette Brown Blackwell, that women showed their vigorous war support most generally, both in gifts from those at home and in active service with the armies. It was in such labor that Clara Barton revealed the great capacity for organizing relief work, and acquired the experience, which enabled her so successfully to found the American Red Cross in 1881 and serve as its active president until, in 1904, she retired at the age of eighty-three.

The work done by such women in the Civil War was recognized as "exerting a greater moral force on the nation than the army that carried loaded muskets." Of these women President Lincoln said, at a meeting in Washington:

> I am not accustomed to use the language of eulogy. I have never studied the art of paying compliments to women. But I must say that if all that has been said by orators and poets since the creation of the world in praise of women, was applied to the women of America, it would not do them justice for their conduct during the war.[7]

And once more women had stood by; stood by with loyalty to the North or to the South, and, North and South alike, with loyalty to war.

Tidewaters of the Suffrage Struggle

By 1866 enough noise had been made by the advocates of equal rights to flush with disapproval many a manly cheek.

Men of peace, especially what might have been called at the period late men of peace—for there were few who held out under the beating of the Civil War's deep waves of feeling —were hardly different from other men in their attitude toward the women's movement. One sterling exception was Alfred H. Love, leader, in that year of 1866, of the Universal Peace Union, whose call for organization had contained this explicit assurance of drastic universality:

> We invite to these meetings all persons, irrespective of Sex, Color, Race or Faith.

This, be it noted, antedated by three years the formation of the National and American Women's Suffrage Associations.

"Having manhood, and womanhood," said the Universal Peace Union in one of its earliest resolutions, "we agree with the wise man of Athens, who settled the disputes of his distracted age by the principle, 'Equality causes no war.' " It was further

> Resolved, that the keen moral sense of woman, her power and influence, are needed in the great reconstruction, that with the ballot in her hand, peace principles must prevail in our government.

Out of its thirty-eight officials, the organization allotted nine places to women, an extraordinary batting average for those days or even days, as we shall see, considerably later. One of the Vice Presidents was Lucretia Mott, who recalled stitching, years ago, the articles of Noah Worcester to her almanac for special reading, and who could not fail to link with her other ideals of freedom the banishment of warfare. Another active sympathizer was Lucy Stone, who attended meetings of the U.P.U. and, as was natural, demanded the voting privilege for women as an essential step if they were to register effectively their influence for peace; and if latter-day events have thus far failed to bear her out, indubitably the opportunity to meet with men on a plane of equality signified a gain for the cause of equal rights and added a new zest to meetings in the past appallingly uncolorful.

No one, reading the proceedings of these conferences, could

doubt that it was not easy to remain an advocate of passive peace before such women as Lucy Stone, Cora Daniels, Josephine Griffing, and others who had learned a technique of bloodless but unrelenting battle. With what sublime courage (or was it strategy, a subtle reliance on feminine appeal?) must have moved the U.P.U. when it appointed, in 1868, a finance committee consisting of three women and not one man to exercise wisdom, restraint, and "experienced guidance"! Alfred Love's loyalty to the woman suffrage movement was rewarded, in 1884, by a tender of the Vice Presidential nomination of the Equal Rights Party, which polled for its Presidential candidate, Belva A. Lockwood (running alone), some twenty-five hundred votes!

A new impetus toward peace was given the women's movement by Mrs. Julia Ward Howe at the time of the Franco-Prussian War. Long disliking Louis Napoleon and his rule, but filled with admiration of the French people and their works of art, Mrs. Howe was deeply moved at the suffering caused by the War and the defeat of the French, a calamity brought upon them, to her view, by an unworthy government. In her *Reminiscences* she says:

> As I was revolving these matters in my mind, while the war was still in progress, I was visited by a sudden feeling of the cruel and unnecessary character of the contest. It seemed to me a return to barbarism, the issue having been one which might easily have been settled without bloodshed. The question forced itself upon me, "Why do not the mothers of mankind interfere in these matters, to prevent the waste of that human life of which they alone bear and know the cost?

Anyone blessed with sufficient perspective might have answered Mrs. Howe's inquiry. He could have told her frankly that women, like men, when a conflict is not remote, insist on seeing it as necessary. It seemed as necessary to French and German women that they should support the War of 1870 as it had to Mrs. Howe that she must aid in the Holy War of 1861. That this had never occurred to her is evident by her next sentence: "I had never thought of this before."

But if she was late in catching her vision, she delayed not at all in going into action. "The august dignity of motherhood and its terrible responsibilities now appeared to me in a new aspect, and I could think of no better way of expressing my sense of these than that of sending forth an appeal to womanhood throughout the world, which I then and there composed."

Dated September, 1870, and translated into French, Spanish, German, Italian and Swedish, the peace appeal was sent out all over the globe. It read:

APPEAL TO WOMANHOOD THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

Again, in the sight of the Christian world, have the skill and power of two great nations exhausted themselves in mutual murder. Again have the sacred questions of international justice been committed to the fatal mediation of military weapons. In this day of progress, in this century of light, the ambition of rulers has been allowed to barter the dear interests of domestic life for the bloody exchanges of the battlefield. Thus men have done. Thus men will do. But women need no longer be made a party to proceedings which fill the globe with grief and horror. Despite the assumptions of physical force, the mother has a sacred and commanding word to say to the sons who owe their life to her suffering. That word should now be heard, and answered as never before.

Arise, then, Christian women of this day! Arise, all women who have hearts, whether your baptism be that of water or of tears! Say firmly: "We will not have great questions decided by irrelevant agencies. Our husbands shall not come to us, reeking with carnage, for caresses and applause. Our sons shall not be taken from us to unlearn all that we have been able to teach them of charity, mercy, and patience. We, women of one country, will be too tender of those of another country, to allow our sons to be trained to injure theirs." From the bosom of the devastated earth a voice goes up with our own. It says: "Disarm, disarm! The sword of murder is not the balance of justice." Blood does not wipe out dishonor, nor violence indicate possession. As men have often forsaken the plough and the anvil at the summons of war, let women now leave all that may be left of home for a great and earnest day of counsel.

Let them meet first, as women, to bewail and commemorate the dead. Let them then solemnly take counsel with each other as to the means whereby the great human family can live in peace, man

as the brother of man, each bearing after his own kind the sacred impress, not of Cæsar, but of God.

In the name of womanhood and of humanity, I earnestly ask that a general congress of women, without limit of nationality, may be appointed and held at some place deemed most convenient, and at the earliest period consistent with its objects, to promote the alliance of the different nationalities, the amicable settlement of international questions, the great and general interests of peace.[8]

On the call of Mrs. Howe, William Cullen Bryant, and Mary F. Davis, a meeting "for the purpose of considering and arranging the steps necessary to be taken for calling a World's Congress of Women in behalf of International Peace," was held in New York in December, 1870. Addresses were made by Lucretia Mott, Octavius Frothingham, and Alfred H. Love. At a later meeting in New York Bryant launched the stern interrogation:

When a battle is fought, women come and bind up the wounds of those whose bodies are torn by cannon balls and grape shot; they tend them in hospitals; they watch night and day by the bedside of those who are delirious with pain; they smooth the pillows of the dying. Shall they be limited to this? Are they to make no effort to *prevent* the evil which they so tenderly seek to mitigate?[9]

They were not, as it happened; they were to act for a while longer just as they had always acted and still act, when war is on. Though Mrs. Howe declared that "our husbands shall not come to us, reeking with carnage, for caresses and applause," they came, and got both, in 1898, their women's doubts assuaged by the appealing strains of "Just Before the Battle, Mother," and "Just Break the News to Mother." They came again, in 1917.

Even Mrs. Howe's campaign was not to be successful. Another meeting in Tremont Temple, Boston, was followed, in the spring of 1871, by the organization of the American Branch of the Women's International Peace Association under the presidency of Mrs. Howe. So controversial was the matter that five meetings were required to consummate the organization. Although *The Advocate of Peace,* descrying in the face of the churches' failure a new Galahad, declared that

"women can prevent war if they will"; though Elihu Burritt let his linguistic accomplishments lead him into remarking that "the daughters of those who were last at the cross and first at the sepulchre of the Prince of Peace; the daughters by spirit-birth of those women who washed the thorn-prints from his lacerated brow, are coming to the rescue of his great inheritance and kingdom on earth"; in spite of all this there were more who saw in this effort of women only fanaticism, sentimentality, or even a menace to public sobriety. Some objected especially to Mrs. Howe's characterization of the movement as Christian; to them it had about it for such an appellation all too faint a smell of powder to seem natural.

In 1872 the aroused peace crusader went to England in the hope of arranging there the longed-for congress of women for peace. Anti-feminist prejudice was strong, however; and when she attended a Paris Peace Congress and asked permission to present her project, she was told "with some embarrassment" that she might address the officers of the society after the meetings had adjourned. Her mission a failure, Mrs. Howe was obliged to return and do the next best thing: arrange a "mothers' day" for peace to be celebrated simultaneously by women all around the world, acting in their home localities.

Some success she had; yet the pamphlet she edited afterwards, containing reports of these meetings, shows what obstacles, both among men and with her own sex also, were in her path. The great Women's Peace Festival of June 2, 1873, produced after all nothing more immediately tangible than meetings, none too well attended and still dominated by men peace leaders, in Boston, New Bedford, Nantucket, New Haven, Ledyard (Connecticut), New York, Brooklyn, Poughkeepsie, Orange (New Jersey), Philadelphia, Wilmington, Chicago, St. Louis, London, Manchester, Geneva, Rome, and Constantinople.

If the world-wide demonstrations were something of a fizzle, because the time was not yet ripe, they served a useful purpose none the less. The American Peace Society was stirred

up so much that for the first time in its career of forty-three years it elected women to office: Mrs. Howe and the widowed Mrs. George C. Beckwith. New determination was given to those already won to a general desire for more peace effort, and some felt their devotion greatly deepened. Among these was Julia Ward Howe herself, who wrote in her diary as her project unfolded:

> I confess that I value more those processes of thought which explain history than those which arraign it. I would not therefore in my advocacy of peace strip one laurel leaf from the graves so dear and tender in our recollection. Our brave men did and dared the best which the time allowed. The sorrow for their loss was none the less brought upon us by those who believed in the military method.

Until her death four years before the War that would have crowned her life with unendurable thorns, Julia Ward Howe struggled—one almost uses without a qualification the patronizing old word manfully!—to speed the end of the war system.

Lucretia Mott, Julia Ward Howe, and Belva A. Lockwood: these were the forerunners of the later women leaders whose work for peace will always, let us hope, be gratefully remembered. All these were subject to the peculiarities of their times and possessed of traits not uncommon to those who must buffet the bulwarks of entrenched traditionalism. But their labor counted, if not heavily at once; and as Mrs. Howe at one time said (and might have said of radicals in general), "The special faults of women are those incidental to a class that has never been allowed to work out its ideal."

Mrs. Lockwood became one of the earliest officers of the Universal Peace Union. She founded the National Arbitration Association at Washington later on, and served for many years on the Commission of the International Peace Bureau.

Women came into the international peace congresses only as visitors until 1889, when they were given the status of official members. In the United States, women had to contend during the last half of the century against very much the same curious mixture of appeal and denial that characterized large

sections of the peace movement in the earlier half. In the 'eighties such movements as the National Arbitration League urged women to use all their power to abolish war. In 1887 the National and the World's W.C.T.U. formed at Nashville educational Peace Departments under the direction of Hannah J. Bailey. In the following year, at Washington, was founded the International Council of Women, which in the next two decades grew until it included seven million members the world around; though actually very conservative in its peace interests, the organization did something to promote the idea of world organization. It stood for "the removal of prejudice, national and racial, and the education of children, youth, and the general public in a proper estimate of what the different nations have successfully contributed to the world's wealth and joy."

The League of Women for Universal Disarmament asked for too much to attract many to its meaningful program; the Women's Universal Alliance for Peace secured the signatures of five million women to a statement disapproving war.

The idea that women of themselves, men's opposition notwithstanding, could by some potent exclusive force drive war from the earth as Saint Patrick de-reptiled Erin, hung on into the twentieth century. That prophet of the flaming penpoint, Olive Schreiner, in her *Woman and Labour* predicted that

> The day when the woman takes her place beside the man in the governance of the affairs of her race, will also be that day that heralds the death of war as a means of arranging human differences.

In her valuable book, *Between War and Peace,* Florence Brewer Boeckel quotes the Swedish feminist, Ellen Key, as saying, in *War, Peace and the Future,*

> The characteristics that are now scornfully called feminine . . . were in the springtime of Christianity active in the suppression of violence. If these assets are again to hold violence at bay, it will be only through the power of women to make them living again, living not only in the souls of men but in the growth and intergrowth of the communities.

And likewise a quotation is selected from an address before the Conference on the Cause and Cure of War, by Dr. Beatrice Hinkle:

War is the product of the irrational (that is to say, unrational) impulses of men toward self-assertion and power; reason is not yet strong enough to control such impulses; they can be controlled only by other and stronger irrational impulses; the impulses of women are toward creation and preservation of life; and because they have been less suppressed and modified than those of men, they are stronger and will be able to overcome them if given full play.

Even the conservative Justice David J. Brewer years ago grew lyrical and spoke, though "not as champion or prophet of female suffrage," of woman and the fact that

Her patriotism is as certain and as strong as that of her brother, and whenever the need comes, although she may not shoulder the musket or draw the sword, she does all that is possible to ameliorate the hardships of war. . . . But while all this is true, you need no assurance that her voice is and always will be potent for peace.[10]

Now it is a cheap and gratuitous indoor sport to contradict the dead; and yet he would be a rarely disciplined realist who could refrain from pointing out that "while all this is true," woman's or any other voice for peace will be voice only. Sounder far on this point was the frank statement of woman's position made by a woman, Mrs. Ellen M. Henrotin, to the National Arbitration and Peace Congress of 1907:

During the Civil War the women on both sides, instead of restraining, urged on the men; in the Austrian-Prussian and Franco-Prussian wars, the same phenomenon was observed—as it was also in the South African and Russian-Japanese wars—perhaps slightly less in the Spanish-American War. When all the considerations are taken into account which should operate to influence women in favor of peace and arbitration, the attitude towards war which she has taken in the past is difficult to comprehend.[11]

Up to the very brink of the World War in which women were to prove indisputably their adaptability to the war machines, they were patronized and assigned a very minor rôle in the peace movement; the only exceptions being those women

of outstanding force of character and intellectual vigor who could not be denied, and of course the consistent welcome shown to women by the more radical peace bodies, including the Friends.

In its entire existence, for example, the American Peace Society from 1828 to 1928 had 691 members of its Executive Committee, Directors, Vice Presidents, and Honorary Councillors, of which only 28 were women—barely more than 4 per cent. In 1914 the American Peace Society had 107 officers, of whom only 12 or 11 per cent were women.

Among the 210 registered members of the American Conference on International Arbitration held at Washington in 1896, not one was a woman. When the Peace Department of the Women's Christian Temperance Union was established in 1887, so poverty-stricken for strong justifications were the leaders who announced the project to the world that the best thing they could find to print was William Ladd's appeal to women, written three-quarters of a century before! The Year Book of the New York Peace Society for as late a year as 1910 reveals that of its 788 individual members 359 or 43 per cent were women; but only three or approximately ⅜ of 1 per cent held any office. Let the Lucy Stone League of to-day add to its chamber of horrors the historical note that the 1915 Lake Mohonk Conference was still prefacing its published lists of guests with the laconic comment: "The asterisk following the name of a gentleman indicates that he was accompanied by his wife." If anyone still wonders at the formation of separate peace organizations composed of women and women-led, here is grist for the mill wheels of his thought.

In his addresses around this country on Women and the Cause of Peace, Baron d'Estournelles de Constant in 1911 paid tribute to the pacific influence of woman. As usual, however, with the bulk of peace speakers, he made his reservations, befitting in his case a patriotic Frenchman:

> The doctrine of republican France is to defend its own if necessary, but not to attack. This is the national sentiment, which our women fully share with our men. On this point their accord is definite and complete.

Their accord, of course, was exactly like that of women in Germany, Austria, Belgium, England, Russia, Italy, and everywhere else in the combatant countries of the war of 1914.

Including, let us not forget, the United States of America. Before any discussion of that conflict it is right to consider a reasonable question certain to be asked. Is there no difference between wars? Are all wars to be treated with equal condemnation? The answer, of course, is No. But it is equally reasonable to insist that if women are ever to function effectively in war prevention, they must recognize that the differences between the ethical motivation of some wars and certain others is infinitely less than immediate war propaganda makes them seem. They will have to contribute, sooner or later, more substantially than they have as yet, to that clamor of anti-war sentiment which, at critical junctures, clogs the war god's chariot wheels.

With the exception of a brave minority of the faithfully defiant, women in the United States took nothing more advanced than the official government position. They proudly wore the military leash; they turned on "slackers" and generously gave their loved ones to the shambles—all from a motive the nobility of which I should be last to deny. There were women, just as there were men, who fought the war policy to the last ditch, and who thereafter used their immunity from combat to solace the persecuted and abused ones among the conscientious objectors and political prisoners. But seekers for a vital difference of behavior between the male and female sexes would need more than a powerful microscope; he would require the lenses of imagination.

The story of those days is still surcharged with passion, and there is no need to comment further on it. The central facts are needed, nevertheless, to round out the volume of war stories of our womanhood, and cannot be omitted. Suffice it to write in the record a few significant congratulatory utterances. Said Senator George E. Chamberlain, Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs:

The women of America up to this day have been more active, have rendered a greater service, and have more carefully fitted

themselves for hardship and future effort than ever before in the history of our country. And I say this without disparaging the splendid work that has been done by our mothers, wives and sisters in every prior war.[12]

Said Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy:

American women have always been ready to answer the call of service and have cheerfully undergone the untold sacrifices and burdens which war places upon them so much more heavily than upon men. . . . Unless our women feel the greatness of the moral issues involved in this contest, and unless they have raised their boys to fight, if necessary, for the things for which we stand, the war can not be won.[13]

In words not without an admixture of irony when seen in the perspective of this historic study, Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War, addressed himself to women thus:

I think there is a significance in the fact that the department of the Government especially charged with the making of war should appeal to the women for the success of such an undertaking. One does not ordinarily associate the making of war with the activities of women. Ordinarily, I think one's mental picture of women in a country at war portrays them as the principal sufferers. And so I think there is a certain significance, perhaps an indication of the extent to which our civilization has gone, when a Secretary of War says to the women that the success of the United States in the making of this war is just as much in the hands of the women as it is in the hands of the soldiers of our army.[14]

The great conflict was won, not by the Allies but by War. Everybody else lost. The fighting stage came to an end, though for many years to come the War will still be fought in economics, politics, and social conditions; for no modern war can stop when the armistice is called. The cessation of battle ushered in a few real changes in the work of women for world peace.

To the names of Lucretia Mott, Julia Ward Howe, and Belva A. Lockwood history will add the names of later women peace leaders whose lives have counted nobly: Anna Garlin Spencer, Lucia Ames Mead, of course Jane Addams, and many another less well known than her life service warrants; just as, abroad, not soon forgotten will be the work for peace

of Bertha von Suttner in Austria, whose book *Lay Down Your Arms* for many years served as an *Uncle Tom's Cabin* for the peace movement; Ellen Robinson, England's great peace orator; and Senora O. C. Angela de Costa, of Argentina, largely responsible for the erection, on a high Andean borderline peak, of the famous peace statue, "The Christ of the Andes." Our American trio still work with vigor for the cause they have never lost sight of.

Since the War of 1917-18

The peace work of women since the War has been greatly multiplied, fostered too, no doubt, by the inevitable post-War disillusionment. It is chiefly of two kinds, the first, though of great educational value, following very much the objectives of the pre-War groups; and the second exhibiting a far more thoroughgoing character and a prophetic daring very different from the movements of twenty years ago.

At the more moderate end of the spectrum is the Conference on the Cause and Cure of War, which meets every year in Washington. It was founded in 1925 by Carrie Chapman Catt, veteran of the woman suffrage struggle, who, if she is not more careful, will make ample amends to posterity for her acceptance in 1917 of a post of leadership in the Women's Committee of the Council of National Defense (and Aggression). In this Conference are joined eleven large women's organizations totaling not far from six million members. They are the American Association of University Women, the Council of Women for Home Missions, the Federation of Women's Boards of Foreign Missions of North America, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations, the National Council of Jewish Women, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, the National League of Women Voters, the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the National Women's Conference of the American Ethical Union, and the National Women's Trade Union League.

Official action, perforce, must be limited to fairly conservative points of view to which agreement may be secured from

so large and diverse a body. The Conference has endorsed the World Court, arbitration, progressive unilateral disarmament, the Kellogg multilateral treaties renouncing aggressive war, etc., but carefully eschews any connection with uncompromising pacifism beyond a tolerant fairness. Its discussions are very much more realistic in tone than those of the larger peace gatherings prior to 1914, and its educational work is of high value. Each of the groups comprising the Conference carries on, by itself, educational activity for international good will.

It is not necessary, and in view of the rapid growth of peace groups would not be wise, to attempt a covering list of all work done by women since the War. Of the more prophetic movements, three stand out significantly. One is the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, counting well above half a hundred thousand members organized in national sections in twenty-five countries and with corresponding societies in at least eighteen more. The League was founded in 1915, by fifteen hundred women meeting at The Hague, electing Jane Addams as its President. Except during the rest of the War years, it has held annual international conferences. It is alert, aware of sub-surface problems, and contains within its ranks some of the ablest women of the world. Its position on war affords an interesting contrast even to the most thoroughgoing women's peace societies of pre-War vintage:

> It aims at uniting women in all countries who are opposed to every kind of war, exploitation and oppression, and who work for universal disarmament and for the solution of conflicts by the recognition of human solidarity, by conciliation and arbitration, and by the establishment of social, political and economic justice for all, without discrimination of sex, race, class or creed.

Another of the thoroughly pacifist societies of women is the Women's Peace Society, founded in 1919 by the late Fanny Garrison Villard, non-resistant daughter of the abolitionist, whose faith in the halfway peace organizations, like that of many other peoples all over the world, was shattered by the war-time spectacles of spineless opportunism. Says the official purpose:

The underlying principle of this Society is a belief in the sacredness of human life under all circumstances.

Its immediate program is International Co-operation, Complete and Universal Disarmament, and Free Trade.

Centering its attack on the institution of war, another pacifist society of women which has sprung up since the World War is the Women's Peace Union of the Western Hemisphere. If ever an equally drastic anti-war declaration has been circulated in the history of the United States, I have yet to learn of it. The affirmation made by members asserts:

I affirm it is my intention never to aid in or sanction war, offensive or defensive, international or civil, in any way, whether by making or handling munitions, subscribing to war loans, using my labor for the purpose of setting others free for war service, helping by money or work any relief organization which supports or condones war.

If not large in numbers, this organization has won a unique place of interest for its special efforts toward the outlawry of war by constitutional amendment. As far back as 1866 the Rhode Island Radical Peace Society circulated petitions to Congress to "dispense with war under all circumstances," the petition receiving many hundreds of signatures. In 1867 a committee appointed by the Universal Peace Society (later Universal Peace Union) appealed fruitlessly to the New York State Constitutional Convention to amend the constitution so as to "remove the causes of war and at the same time abolish all provisions for war itself, by not legalizing that which is inhuman, unjust, and unchristian."

In 1901 the conference of the Universal Peace Union at Washington adopted a set of "convictions." Among them were a series of steps toward peace education, to "open the way for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, that will take out all the war clauses thereof."

All of these semi-gestures contained the germ idea, nationally or by state applied, of that outlawry of war which has preempted the use of the phrase in behalf of international joint delegalization. They were, obviously, very differently conceived. In them, however, is a nearer relationship to the

startling introduction into the Senate by Senator Lynn J. Frazier, in 1926, of S. J. Res. 100, re-introduced as S. J. 45, a resolution providing that the Constitution be so amended that

Section 1. War for any purpose shall be illegal, and neither the United States nor any State, Territory, association, or person subject to its jurisdiction shall prepare for, declare, engage in, or carry on war or other armed conflict, expedition, invasion, or undertaking within or without the United States, nor shall any funds be raised, appropriated, or expended for such purpose.

Section 2. All provisions of the Constitution and of the article in addition thereto and amendment thereof which are in conflict with or inconsistent with this article are hereby rendered null and void and of no effect.

Section 3. The Congress shall have power to enact appropriate legislation to give effect to this article.[15]

How fantastic this amendment may seem to nearsight, no one is more aware, in all probability, than its sponsors themselves. It is, I contend, of genuine significance. It supplies real "teeth" to the Pact of Paris and serves as the focal point for a campaign of great educational value while public sentiment is being wooed for so drastic and unevasive a proposal.

It is evident, I think, that there is among women, as among men, a new, aggressive, uncompromising spirit that aims far out beyond the most legitimate forms of time-serving.

However, let no one be deceived. Counting liberally all the women of the United States who openly take the pacifist stand, they are numerically only an oasis in a desert of apathy, fair-weather pacifism, and mob-minded conformity. They are if anything a shade more venturesome than men in occupying their outposts, and they hold their positions with magnificent fidelity. But they are obliged to stand and scan the barren wastes in vain for any great caravans of their sex set out to join them in their far-flung endeavors.

At the second session of the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, a meeting which endorsed, in early 1928, all the militaristic implications of "adequate" preparedness and whose primary aim seemed to be to offset the work of women pacifists, there were present four hundred delegates from thirty-four national "patriotic" organizations of women. Gen-

eral Pershing may be pardoned for exclaiming, in 1926, "I am not disquieted by reports of women's organizations advocating pacifism." Certainly none of the various proponents of military training in colleges who have sought popular girls with pretty faces to serve as honorary officers—possibly the acme of incentive to romantic young janissaries—have had to search with fatiguing diligence. From grandmother to granddaughter the gauntlet of chivalry is handed on. They may not be exactly the same as men in their reaction to war, but they are his sisters under the skin.

Still the hoary old legend of women's special aptitudes refuses to die. It lives in respect to numerous social relationships entirely apart from women's special biological differentiations. It lives, and becomes periodically vocal, to-day just as of old. The superstition that women would vote markedly different from men has been already slain, it seems, by the experience of the few short years since the Nineteenth Amendment became a fact. That its counterpart in the realm of international conflict persists after the lessons of our national wars, is due perhaps less to a truly high regard for the potentialities of womankind than a lingering of that chivalry which accorded superior virtues (along with inferior status) to women for so many centuries.

"We need women in the government," said Ezra Heywood, a pacifist of the turbulent post-War days of 1866, "for their spirit is above war." Their spirit, as she who reads the facts will plainly see, is no more above war than the spirit of men. The contribution of women to the abolition of war is certain to be large; it may fall short of that by men, or it may actually transcend man-directed pacific activities. Increasingly, I predict, the so-called differences between the sexes will fade out of the picture and the achievement of a planetary peace will be the work, not of national or racial or sex groups in any particular sense, but of a coöperating human race.

The hope that the feminine half of humanity will effect a *coup de théâtre* and banish the hated villain of the piece is just another romantic "dream of fair women."

CHAPTER XIV

THE MILITARY JUGGERNAUT

In what light we are viewed by superior beings may be gathered from a piece of late West India news, which possibly has not reached you. A young Angel of distinction, being sent down to this world on some important business, for the first time, had an old courier spirit assigned him as his guide; they arrived over the seas of Martinico, in the middle of the long day of obstinate fights between the fleets of Rodney and De Grasse. When through the clouds of smoke he saw the fire of the guns, the decks covered with mangled limbs, and bodies dead or dying; the ships sinking, burning, or blown high into the air; and the quantity of pain, misery and destruction the crews yet alive were thus with so much eagerness dealing round to one another; he turned angrily to his guide and said—"You blundering blockhead! you undertook to conduct me to the earth, and you have brought me into hell!" "No, Sir," says the guide, "I have made no mistake: this is really the earth and these are men. Devils never treat one another in this cruel manner; they have more sense, and more of what men vainly call humanity."—BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, to Dr. Joseph Priestley.

CHAPTER XIV

THE MILITARY JUGGERNAUT

THE weapons of peace have developed somewhat in the last one hundred years, though basically peace methods are the same. The weapons of war have undergone in the same period an amazing transformation, steadily acquiring new adaptability and deadliness.

From the time when gunpowder was first introduced into warfare in the sixteenth century, weapons using it developed with comparative slowness for three hundred years. When the Pilgrims landed and depended primarily on arms in persuading the native Indians to "have faith in Massachusetts," such weapons as they had were superior to those of the red man, but even at that, in modern language, they were "not so good." Attacked by thirty or forty Indians bent on driving them out, and yelling something described as "Woach, woach, ha ha hach woach!" by an old-time chronicle, the colonists should have wondered, though of course they didn't, if the "ha ha" were not directed at their arms. "Most of their pieces," however, "go off; the rest call for a firebrand to light their matches, and one of Standish's men, seizing a log from the fire and clapping it on his shoulder, runs to those on the shore, who are now able to get off their guns." [1] Often indeed these clumsy pieces "by the moisture of rain were out of order." For a long time whales disported themselves hard by the Mayflower, and made marks for those who would disport themselves as sharpshooters. One day when a whale drew unusually near, a colonist attempted to add to the store of oil. But alas! "his musket flew in pieces, both stock and barrel; yet thanks be to God, neither he, nor any man else was hurt with it, though many were thereabout."

The fiery Captain Miles himself was a little better fixed, for he possessed a "snaphence"—a gun with a flintlock; and with this masterpiece of destruction he was able in another encounter to shoot an Indian chief in the shoulder just in the nick of time. Yet even this success cannot be attributed either to Standish or his snaphence; for in the words of another ancient writer, his shot was "directed by the provident hand of the most high God."

By the time that Colonial troops were arrayed at Bunker Hill, had they anything much more effective to rely on? Not if you can trust the official *Regulations for the Order and Discipline of the Troops of the United States,* as adopted four years later in 1779. It took exactly six hundred and ninety-three words of the instructions to tell how a soldier should load and discharge one of the firelocks of that day, in language whose quaintness is accentuated by the sharp contrast between the movements used then and those set forth, say, in one hundred and ninety-four crisp words of *The Plattsburg Manual.* The latter rightly says, "the modern rifle is one of the most perfect pieces of scientific machinery in the world."

Says the same respected authority, "The cave man knocked over his foe with a rude club. The operation is greatly refined to-day." Without pausing to challenge such a concept of refinement, one must admit at once the truth of what is meant.

But most of this development has taken place within the last one hundred years, the same period which covers the origin and rise of peace societies. Perhaps the greatest speeding-up of weapon evolution began with the invention of the needle-gun, by Johann Nicholas von Dreyse, who for this splendid contribution to cultural progress was made a nobleman in 1864, at which time his gun after several modifications had been in use by Prussian armies for over twenty years.

In those unhurrying times, nations were not so quick to follow the deadly inventions of each other. Colonel R. Delafield, U.S.A., Major of the Corps of Engineers, carried out the orders of Jefferson Davis when the later Confederate leader was Secretary of War under President Pierce, and served as a

member of a "Military Commission to the Theater of War in Europe," meaning of course the war in the Crimea. In his report to our government he said:

> It is a remarkable fact that notwithstanding a knowledge of breech-loading small arms for at least two centuries, and that every museum of arms in Europe has numerous specimens, no satisfactory weapon for war purposes has yet been invented. . . . Prussia alone, of all the continental powers, has adopted such a system for infantry, using therefor the needle-gun; and although in use in her army for many years past, and well known in all its details, no other nation has been willing to follow her example. Celerity and rapidity of fire are the main points aimed at by the many inventors and advocates of this modification of the musket. We know that with the present weapons hundreds of rounds of ammunition are fired without producing any effect, and probably not one shot in a thousand rounds issued to the soldier ever does execution.[2]

The case of the torpedo affords an interesting example of the once laggard way in which military inventions were carried to perfection. As far back as 1585, it is said, an Italian engineer named Gianibelli partly destroyed a bridge at Antwerp by small boat-loads of powder set off from the action of clockwork. It was not until 1730 that Desaguliers, a Frenchman, started the development of underwater rocket-type torpedoes.[3]

Modern artillery had its inception in 1855 with the invention of the breech-loading rifle by the Englishman, Armstrong, who was knighted in 1859 for his "public services" and in 1887 elevated to the peerage.

Cartoonists in the opening days of the Civil War made merry over the long range runs being gradually worked out. One of them, "Cham" (Amédée de Noé, of France), suggested that the word of command in drill would possibly be "Attention! Spyglass! Fire!" And this actually seemed a joke to people unaware of how things were to change.

Think momentarily of the forty-two centimeter guns and sixty-mile range Big Berthas of the World War; think of the more recent tinkering with death rays and death concussions; think of the increase from thirty usable poison gases at the end

of the World War in comparison to more than a hundred now; think of huge four-thousand-pound demolition bombs, ten times the size of any available in 1918! And then for an enlightening contrast think back to the puny thirty-two pounders of the Rebellion, howitzers firing a projectile that contained within itself a pound and a half of powder and was expelled by a pound of the same simple, old-fashioned explosive!

The development of weapons, whether artillery, sidearms, rifle or whatnot, has been stupendous. There has been no discovery of modern science left unexploited by the military, no device left unexplored for its lethal possibilities. There is nothing but a grimly laughable resemblance between the weapons of combat used a hundred years ago and the up-to-date instruments of death.

The Mobilization of Armament

The "impossibility" of war—meaning its utter incapability of settling any question—was the thesis offered to a skeptical world by the Russian Pole, Jan Bliokh (or Jean Bloch) in the last years of the nineteenth century. An economist and banker, not a peace "worker" at all in the usual sense, Bliokh brought against war a new type of criticism. Of a scientific mind, "keen as a sportsman on the trail of facts," Bliokh in his 6-volume work on *The Warfare of the Future, from the Technical, Political, and Economic Points of View* analyzed the steady mechanization of war and prophesied that increasingly would large-scale conflicts result either in a long-drawn-out stalemate or a pseudo-victory costing far more than any value gained. In 1902, shortly after his death, his "Museum of War and Peace" at Lucerne was functioning to show graphically by various exhibits the general basis of his theory.

In the development of defense, especially through long-range artillery, smokeless powder, and improvements in fortifications and entrenchment, he saw technical factors which to his mind were then assuming a steady trend toward protracted trench warfare. Battle, he concluded, became less and less significant as compared to economic organization—a view

taken now by most students of the factors involved in modern warfare.

Bliokh was in England for a time giving some lectures applying his ideas to the Boer War while it was going on. While there he offered a table to show the enormous probable daily costs of a future general European War. His figures struck many as fantastic, just as prophecies to-day by the critics of war regarding the destructive capacity of future warfare are often hailed as unduly sensational. How ultra-conservative were his estimates is shown by the following comparison between his prophecy and the daily cost of the World War to the same five belligerents:

	Bliok's Estimate (1901)	*Daily Cost of World War* (1914-1918)
Germany	$5,100,000	$25,737,179
Austria	2,600,000	13,219,846
Italy	2,560,000	7,957,691
France	5,100,000	16,546,655
Russia	5,600,000	14,483,301

These figures are not offered to argue the costliness of war. They depict strikingly how warfare has grown to titanic dimensions within a short period, and they warn against an undervaluation of war's consequences should the war method be longer tolerated.

Bliokh foresaw a tremendous advance in the technical equipment of battling fleets and armies. In this field too his vision seemed to not a few projected into the realm of dreams. It is undeniable that time has shown some of Bliokh's detailed fears (thus far, that is) unrealized. But his "dreams" of war technique seem now naïve for their inadequacy. The development of fighting machinery has already reached the point where only a madman could think we have gone beyond the initial stages of a progress in mutual destruction which, if permitted to continue, will bring such desolation to this planet as it has not known since the legendary odyssey of Noah.

In whatever room of Mars' well-financed mansion you may choose to look, you will find horrors stored up, as Bluebeard's

wife found in the one room of the now-tame medieval castle. On the surface of the sea float modern cruisers with a speed of thirty-five to thirty-eight nautical miles an hour—a once undreamed-of rate of progress. Such a cruiser's eight-inch guns are now as potent as the twelve-inch guns of just a scant few years ago. Under the water the submarine, called by Rear-Admiral Sims "the most wonderful agent of warfare ever invented," [5] has already progressed from the seventy-four-ton *Holland* of 1900 to the three-thousand-ton VS type of the United States Navy. Professor Oswald Flamm, designer of the renowned *Deutschland,* declares that "development is natural; there is no cessation; every year brings new developments." [6]

Across the breast of Mother Earth crawl death-spitting tanks that dwarf the mighty venomed reptiles of the last great holocaust, rendering in a dozen years the picturesque squadrons of cavalry all but archaic. The range of guns has been more than doubled if not trebled since the Armistice.

Great fleets of man-conceived mosquitoes becloud the air, capable of loosing upon their helpless creators the malarial pestilence of poison gas or the stinging bite of bombs. General M. M. Patrick, formerly chief of the U. S. Army Air Service, has said that twelve bombing airplanes of 1928, in a single air raid, could drop as many tons of bombs as the Germans used on London in the entire World War.[7]

By 1925 planes had succeeded in carrying a load of 13,228 pounds.[8] By the end of 1927 the total number of military airplanes in the world nearly reached 11,000, thrice the number for 1923. If the *New York Times* announces in March, 1928, that in the country leading in military aviation "New French Plane Carries Six Guns—Secretly Built Bleriot Makes 130 Miles an Hour at 18,000 Feet Altitude—Huge Machine Is Called Greatest Fight Craft," it also announces our own checkmate in April next, "Six-Gun Attack Planes to Figure in Mock War—New Machines Will Get First Try-Out in Large Scale Operations at Langley Field." Under the "five-year act" passed by Congress in 1927, the United States Army alone will have

1800 first-class airplanes by 1932. Already, as a writer in the *Times* declared, this program in not much more than two years has "made the United States Army Air Service one that will bear comparison with that of any similar force in the world." And yet an Associated Press dispatch of August 20, 1929, quoted Representative W. Frank James of Michigan, chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, as declaring that the five-year program was even then obsolete. "Where five millions were authorized before," he said, "fifty millions are needed now."

The Medical Corps makes great progress in treatment of the sick and wounded. Sanitary gains are constantly made, such as the discovery of succinchlorimide, a water-purifying chemical. But of what use are these if there is one per cent of truth in the sensational statement by the British Tory, Winston Churchill, that "A study of diseases—of pestilences methodically prepared and deliberately launched upon man and beast—is certainly being pursued in the laboratories of more than one great country"?

More than $3,500,000,000 is spent annually by all the nations of the world in war preparations or so-called "national defense." This vast sum amounts to about two dollars per head, or ten dollars per family, of the entire human race.[9]

In this continuous contest the United States holds its end up proudly, as we shall see. Not only are we mobilizing armament; we are mobilizing the strategy of its use. Following is an Associated Press dispatch from Washington dated February 17, 1927:

> War planning is a job that keeps a small group of close mouthed, specially selected officers in the War Department in a state of industry approaching that of perpetual motion.
>
> The plans for offensive and defensive military operations against every possible enemy are in their keeping. They fill huge steel safes and are checked carefully against every international controversy in order that they may be in readiness for instant application in case of a national emergency.
>
> As Secretary Kellogg and his aides, at the far end of the same corridor that borders on the war plans' offices, strive to adjust a

controversy by diplomacy, the army experts overhaul their papers relating to the military situation existing at the time between the United States and the other nation involved.

The job of keeping the war plans up to date in the light of ever changing international issues is one that calls for continuous effort. They have to be revised also to give the correct employment to new arms as their superiority over the older weapons is disclosed.

The war planners are constantly in touch with State Department officials, military attachés in foreign capitals and numerous other governmental agencies. It is no secret that the plans in their keeping provide in detail for setting the military machine in motion with a full destructive force against any enemy at the earliest possible moment after hostilities have been declared.

For a major or minor emergency they tell not only how many men will be needed by the army but how they are to be transported, equipped, trained if necessary, and supplied with the many essentials a modern army needs for field service.

The State Department usually refers new treaties to the war planners before they are given final approval and sent to the Senate for ratification, and sometimes even before they are formally drafted.

It is doubtful whether this state of affairs is quite as neatly atrocious as the exigencies of newspaper interest require; but that such a situation approximately exists can hardly be denied.

"War planners" is an unfair term, and the strategists would be justified in protesting its use. They do not, of course, sit like movieland monsters deliberately dragging nations into war. It is not they but their point of view which gives the phrase a certain support. For their arts and crafts are not the kind that erect a house of peace but the charnel house of hate and conflict.

The mobilization of armament has been making gains in its mowing down of human targets. Dr. Thomas Dick, the religious and astronomical philosopher of old Dundee, estimated in 1846 that war had previously destroyed 14,000,000,000 of human beings, making 2,333,333 every year, 6,481 every day, and four and a half every minute—doubtless resting too much confidence in the preëvolutionary dates at that time ascribed to Genesis! Edmund Burke earlier tried to prove that the figure was about 30,000,000,000. The Massachusetts Peace So-

ciety, after an "investigation," counted the number killed in all wars as 3,346,000,000. Said Elihu Burritt, also something of a mathematical stuntster, "The blood of the 14,000,000,000 of human beings that have perished by war would fill a circular lake 17 miles in circumference, 10 feet deep; in which all the navies of the world might float." Allowing for the zeal which produced such figures, it may be seen that there is more poesy than fact in the lines of a modern poet:

> As many men as whose torn flesh is drowned
> In battle-blood on any battle-ground,
> That ground serenely can assimilate.[10]

Laying Genesis aside as beyond the bounds of certified public accountancy, it is possible to quote Colonel Leonard P. Ayres, who has computed the direct losses by war between 1793 and 1914 as six million.[11] This affords a basis of comparison; and at once the mind leaps to the fact that in the four years of the World War alone ten million were killed directly in combat.[12]

Here, too, I am not arguing war's destructive horror. These figures add a certain further weight to the contention that the race is rapidly learning more efficient means of self-eradication. The accompanying map and chart show what has been happening to "civilization."

The Mobilization of Industry

In his book on Industrial Preparedness, published in 1916, C. E. Knoeppel printed an introduction by General Leonard Wood. Said the General:

> Preparedness for modern war means not only the training and organizing of men, but the most thorough and complete organization of the industrial resources of the nation.

Such a statement in such a time had something of freshness about it. To-day it would be as original to say that ears of corn could not be grown without stalks.

One of the military lessons of the war was the support of armies in the field by the mobilization of home industry. The



Used by permission of the New York Times Co.

THE ARMED WORLD OF TO-DAY, SHOWING THE PROPORTION OF STANDING ARMIES TO CIVILIAN POPULATION, THE FORCES TOTALING 5,500,000



Used by permission of the New York Times Co.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE WORLD'S TOTAL NAVAL TONNAGE AMONG THE NATIONS (IN PERCENTAGES) BEFORE, DURING, AND SINCE THE WORLD WAR, UP TO THE LONDON NAVAL CONFERENCE OF 1930

lesson has not been forgotten. From the end of the War to now the War Department has zealously worked to regiment the industrial life of our country, and since 1922 with a definite plan. Judge Elbert H. Gary and Charles M. Schwab, two kings of the steel industry, journeyed to West Point for the Advisory Board of the New York Ordnance District, in 1924, and while there Judge Gary said to the officers and associates of the Board:

> If industry will lend its co-operation and formulate war plans within its own organization, the requirements of the field armies can be met soon enough to prevent defeat by any enemy or combination of enemies that might attack.[13]

Plans for national defense have been made by manufacturing plants, said Mr. Gary.

> Man power can be mobilized and trained now, with the plans formulated by the Advisory Committee, made up of industrialists, in eight months for 3,500,000 men.

On November 24, 1925, Secretary of War Dwight F. Davis addressed Philadelphia's Union League. Press reports of the Secretary's address indicate very adequately what is afoot:

> So great has been the progress of the War Department's previously undisclosed programme for preparing to convert peace-time industries to the requirements of war, that, if the United States were to be drawn into a conflict today, the nation would be equipped to place 4,000,000 men in action *anywhere on the face of the globe* [italics mine]. . . .
>
> In the Philadelphia area alone, in its preparedness-inspired programme of industrial conversion for war-time purposes, Secretary Davis revealed that the Baldwin Locomotive Works here have agreed to concentrate its vast equipment on the production of heavy artillery, literally on a moment's notice.
>
> Identical arrangements have been clinched with the J. G. Brill Company, which produces trolley cars and motor bus bodies in great quantities, to turn to the manufacture of mobile field artillery. The Atwater Kent Company, whose facilities are now given over to the production of radio instruments, will convert its machinery and personnel to the manufacture of time fuses and instruments necessary to the proper control of artillery fire.
>
> Secretary Davis went on to say that the War Department con-

templated the mobilization of not only men but of all industry as well.[14]

In pursuance of this policy, during the year ending in June, 1927, one hundred and four officers were devoting their full time to "procurement planning."[15] Some thirty-nine were doing likewise with part time while forty-three reserve officers in the various branches were engaged in part-time work on the same sort of jobs. In comparison to the one thousand five hundred and seventy-seven reserve officers working for "the mobilization of man power" this forty-three is small, and the War Department—granted its point of view—is justified in feeling the balance disproportionate. The Army Industrial College, established to train officers for industrial preparedness duties and also to act as something of a normal school in its field, is still small but growing; and if American militarism proceeds unchecked it will inevitably assume large proportions.

This intensified industrial readiness for war is being pushed farther and farther to the limits of efficiency-achievement. The program was expected to be worked out by 1930. No one can blame the War Department for doing this particular thing; it is carrying out as well as it can the commands which it feels have been laid upon it.

The effect may well be imagined of this preparedness doctrine infiltrating into the minds of hundreds of thousands employed in American industries, and also the imitative thoughts it is certain to generate in the minds of peoples that suffered while we profited industrially from the World War, nations that are justly jealous of our present industrial supremacy.

The excuse for putting through such a program is the old one of "peace" and "protection." It is probably true that the psychological effect on the rest of the world is less inflammatory than more obvious forms of preparedness. But on the other hand, our post-War position of being "flush" with this world's goods accentuates a hostility already great enough in the parts of this world whose goods we do not yet possess.

Peace and protection? If continually being on guard against attack is peace, we are in much the calm and comfort of a

man wearing a bullet-proof vest. The armadillo is marvelously protected; but who wants to be an armadillo?

The Mobilization of Science

"If it be true that the sciences are noble in proportion as they are useful," exclaimed the author of *Holbrook's Military Tactics* in 1826, "what advantage may not the science of war be said to possess above almost every other."

Are we as far away from such an attitude as a century of marvelous advancement in science ought to make us? If not, what is the reason? It is, I think, partly that science on the one hand and the war system on the other are equally rooted in our economic development. But also there is the fact that men of science, notwithstanding their many services to human welfare—and there is no less selfish professional group in the world—have freely given their aid to the war machine. The "internationalism of science" has succumbed in every crisis to nationalistic considerations. In war and the peace that consists so largely in preparation for war, science is the pliant tool of the military.

Pasteur, during the Franco-Prussian War, returned his diploma of an honorary degree to the University of Bonn, saying, "The sight of that parchment is odious to me." In another place he declared, "Every one of my future works will bear on its title page the words 'Hatred to Prussia. Revenge! Revenge!' " And as Benjamin Harrow points out in his book *The Romance of the Atom,* the great, humane Frenchman set out, by way of a personal revenge, to make French beer better than German!

"If peace continues for any length of time," says Harrow, "the French and German scientists will get together just as they did after the Franco-Prussian War." But what of that? "If war comes again, the scientists will part again, and again call one another names, just as they did during the Franco-Prussian War and during the Great War."

Mr. Harrow offers a suggestion which goes to the roots of the scientist's view of his social responsibility; the generally accepted dictum of the scientific world that the man of science is

a cold, precise, machine-like creature, whose only function is to deal with pure science, not with the uses to which his discoveries may be put. Mr. Harrow wonders if there is not a higher rôle:

Admitting the view expressed by Soddy that scientific men stand for something higher in the world than anything which has as yet found expression and representation in governments, particularly in their international relations, the very first task which confronts scientists is to continue to think scientifically after they have left their laboratory. Robinson in his *Mind in the Making* and in *The Humanizing of Knowledge* appeals for the scientific spirit among the masses at large. My contention is that the scientific spirit must first be engendered among the scientists themselves, for them then to spread the gospel. They must be taught to regard the scientific method as one applicable to a universal outlook on life and not merely to a chemical reaction. It follows from this that once such a view has become firmly entrenched, the fundamental difference in method between scientist on the one hand, and non-scientist (including industrialist, diplomat and politician) on the other, will become apparent. It will no longer be possible for the type of men who at present control the destinies of the world to misuse the glorious inventions and discoveries of science.

There is a story, perhaps legendary, in the old *Brewster's Encyclopedia,* about the horror with which Sir Isaac Newton greeted the announcement by Professor Gregory of Oxford that the latter's father had completed the model of an invention for making artillery more destructive.

Sir Isaac was much displeased with it, saying, that if it tended as much to the preservation of mankind as to their destruction, the inventor would have deserved a great reward; but as it was contrived solely for destruction, and would soon be known to the enemy, he rather deserved to be punished and urged the Professor very strongly to destroy it, and if possible to suppress the invention.

True it is that scientists are not to blame if the hand of fate has placed a heavy percentage of their products in a dual relationship, holding power both of good and evil. Can they not, however, throw the weight of their great influence unhesitatingly against the perversion of the good to race-suicidal ends?

Some scientists, like Professor Soddy of Nobel Prize fame

in chemistry, have outspokenly ranged themselves on the side of peace. But how many others have done so?

Professor W. A. Noyes of the University of Illinois, feeling a somewhat similar impulse to do what he could to use science for the building of good will, spent a sabbatical year in Europe working toward the reconciliation of French and German scientists. As Harrow reports, nevertheless:

> A record of these conversations merely strengthens the conviction that in politics the majority of scientists think like the masses at large.[16]

French and German scientists are possessed of no essential differences from scientists of other nationalities. In June of 1928, our Assistant Secretary of War Charles Burton Robbins told the graduating class at West Point that "Science and warfare now go hand in hand." [17]

Robert Hall, famous preacher of more than a century ago, spoke of war as "liquid fire and distilled damnation." Words would fail him to-day were he to see the prophetic character of his figure of speech. Liquid fire is only one small drop in the great flood of distilled damnation being prepared with an almost religious devotion for the immolation of humanity.

The deadliness of gases has doubtless sometimes been exaggerated. Wild tales have been told of poison gases so powerful that where they had once been liberated vegetation would never grow again. The loose talk, all the same, has not been confined to pacifists. The soothing-sayers have contributed their share, usually basing their contentions regarding the harmlessness of toxic gases on the experience of the World War.

You might as well predict the development of steamships by the experiences of Noah. It is arrant nonsense for a responsible member of our Chemical Warfare Service to say, as he said in 1927:

> Alarmists have repeatedly mistaken the effect of new inventions. The ability to wage gas warfare is a blessing—not a curse—and will make for the future security, peace, and happiness of the world.[18]

It is also nonsense for an officer of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers to state, as he did in 1927:

> Undoubtedly international conflicts of the future will be fought out with gas, and other chemicals, but they will be far more humane, less bloody, and more painless than if shot and shell were used exclusively.[19]

I naturally hold no brief for shot and shell. But how seriously such romantic imaginings are taken by those charged with the tasks of handling men who are gassed in warfare may be gathered from a booklet published by the United States government, written by Commander E. W. Brown of the Medical Corps and published in 1928. It is entitled *Chemical Warfare and the Naval Medical Officer.* In pointing out "the requirements which a chemical compound must satisfy to be adapted to chemical warfare use," Commander Brown sets down as his opening point:

> (1) It must first of all be highly toxic. This indicates that it must reach such a concentration when projected in the field as to be either lethal or at least casualty producing. The gas must also be one which, while fatal in high concentrations, will cause more or less serious injury in concentrations far below that necessary to kill.

"What," asks Commander Brown, "would be the ideal gas for a naval attack?" He answers:

> It is generally conceded that a powerful vesicant acting instantly would answer the requirements.

Among the responsibilities which the *Handbook for the War Department General Staff* (1924) charges upon the Chemical Warfare Service is "the formulation and development of the tactical doctrine of chemical warfare, *both offensive and defensive.*"

How humane and how pleasant are the effects of some of the moderate gases, some of the "persistent gases," in the case of which "the area around the point of burst of the shell will be contaminated and will remain a hazard for periods which may sometimes last for weeks"?

There is blue stage asphyxia.

This term was applied in the World War to the stage of lung edema when cyanosis was well developed, but prior to the signs of failing circulation. As the edema develops in the lungs, the breathing becomes more rapid and panting and of a characteristic shallow type. The ears, lips, and, progressively, the entire face assumes a cyanotic, bluish-red tint which may deepen to the intense violet of advanced cyanosis, and there may be visible distension of the superficial veins of the face, neck, or chest. There are copious frothy sputum, frequent cough, with respirations of 40 to 48 per minute, elevated temperature, and a full, strong pulse in the neighborhood of 100. This condition is most frequently seen on the second day after gassing.

There is also gray stage asphyxia.

This term was applied to the stage of circulatory collapse. The patient may recover from blue stage asphyxia or he may pass into the gray stage as the result of a dilated and failing heart. The color becomes an ashen gray, the expression anxious and staring, and respiratory difficulty is shown by the strained effect of the muscles around the nostrils. There is intense oxygen want. The breathing is markedly hurried and shallow and a rapid running pulse of 130 or over develops. The prognosis is distinctly bad in this stage and the outcome is usually determined within 72 hours of the time the victim was gassed. Apparent recovery from gray stage asphyxia may be succeeded by a severe or even fatal bronchopneumonia.

Just as in a previous section I cited figures not to argue the cost of war in life or treasure, but to demonstrate the advances made in killing-proficiency, so I argue here to the same end. There is in gas warfare, science's latest purveyor to the maw of Mars, the same old race between attack and protection. The gas mask used in the Navy in early 1928 had gone through some thirty-three distinct changes. Gases themselves, leaving out the mythical or unknown gases knowledge of which is confined to laboratories, had progressed in killing power:

The comparative toxicity of the lung irritants and vesicants by inhalation is compared in the following table for 30-minute periods of exposure:

	Ounces per 1,000 cubic feet
Chlorine	3.0
Chlorpicrin	.8
Phosgene	.3
Mustard	.07
Lewisite	.05

Every government in the world knows of cacodyl isocyanide, a gas so terrorful that hardened chemists and military men have a bad job convincing themselves that any government would ever use it. And the possibilities of toxic gases are only in their infancy.

The airplane is the trusted messenger of death, counted on to hover over cities of well-nigh defenseless, ant-like humans like the avenging angel. Everything from lethal liquids to cremating phosphorous may be rained down on fighting lines or the crowds back home huddled like rats in a sewer. The humans will die either in or out of the house.

There is continually conflicting evidence on the effectiveness of anti-aircraft gunfire. It is highly questionable if its recent development has outstripped that of offensive military aviation. In 1924 Brigadier-General P. R. C. Groves, Chief of Staff of the British Royal Flying Corps during the War, was responsible for the statement that

> early in the late conflict the British Ministry of Munitions estimated that in order to score a direct hit upon an aëroplane flying at 5,000 feet and capable of a speed of 100 miles an hour, no less than 162,000 guns would have to fire simultaneously. The experience of the War [which needs checking against every new development] bore out that estimate. There is a difference of opinion as to the number of aëroplanes brought down by anti-aircraft fire over Great Britain in the course of the recent conflict, but the total can be placed fairly safely at under six. . . . In the future war . . . the only effective defense against aircraft attack will be the aerial counter-offensive, and the only effective safeguard against aerial aggression will be the threat of reprisals in kind.[20]

The other side of the argument was well put by J. M. Scammell, former head of the Political Science Department of the

University of California in a recent address at that institution. Says Dr. Scammell:

> As a matter of fact, it would be virtually impossible for enough airplanes to break through the anti-aircraft guns of a city to do any great damage. During the World War the Germans fired 150,000 mustard gas shells into an area about as large as London, with a total of only fifty deaths.[21]

There is no standing still. Already in at least four countries experiments are going forward to work out a type of plane with silent engine, with the noise of propellers minimized by using many small blades instead of two large ones, and rendered semi-invisible by peculiar greenish paints.

I had rather, on this matter, trust the military men and technicians. It is worthy of note that when the Brussels Conference for the Protection of Civilians against gas warfare met in January, 1928, and went thoroughly into every phase of the question, these twenty-five experts gathered under the auspices of the International Red Cross, found themselves nonplussed. Said a special *New York Times dispatch,* agreeing with those in other papers:

> Although the delegates were disinclined to discuss the conference proceedings on the ground that they did not wish to arouse civilians needlessly regarding the horrors of gas warfare, it was learned that most of the protective measures thus far advanced were considered impracticable.[22]

General von Deimling of Germany, in March, 1930, issued a public protest over the expenditure of funds for protection of the civil population against poison gas service, quoting Professor Haber, director of Germany's poison gas service during the War to the effect that protection is utterly impracticable. No mask, he said, can stop the so-called "blue cross" gas, which is so fine that it cannot be strained out. "Science," said General von Deimling, "can invent a new gas almost every day which will always be one step ahead of the best protective devices."

While commercial airplanes cannot always be converted easily into day-time bombing planes, General Groves in a report

prepared for the League of Nations in July, 1930, stated that without difficulty they can be used as night-bombers.

Winston Churchill's alarm about germ warfare, previously mentioned, is needless, in the opinion of a League of Nations sub-committee reporting in 1924. Microbes were too difficult to spread, most medical experts consulted were agreed, and were too easily combated. Yet in 1925 Dr. J. Maly, a Czecho-slovakian subject resident in Paris, is reported to have offered a project for the use of pathogenic germs in warfare to the United States War Department. The War Department is stated to have replied, "This Department is of the opinion that from the practical viewpoint pathogenic organisms could not be used effectively for military purposes and is therefore not interested in investigations of this character at the present time." [23]

The time may come soon, notwithstanding present impracticability, when the development from obsidian knife to porphyry mace to bows and arrows to rifles to machine guns to lewisite, may take the logical next step.

We have gone rather far as it is. Machiavelli, in his *History of Florence,* asserts that "at the battle of Anghieri in 1440 in the midst of so complete a rout, in a battle so obstinate that it lasted four hours, only a single man was killed, who again met his death not by the enemy's fire or by any honorable blow, but by a fall from his horse and being trodden underfoot by others." Not remotely typical, perhaps, for in many an early war slaughter was enormous. But interesting and not without a certain significance.

There can be no gentle art of combat such as this, in our more educated age. Mr. Churchill is not, I believe, speaking too sensationally when he says:

> Mankind has never been in this position before. Without having improved appreciably in virtue or enjoying wiser guidance, it has got into its hands for the first time the tools by which it can unfailingly accomplish its own extermination.[24]

Amazingly enough, the Pollyannas are still among us. In the deadly possibilities of the airplane, many seem to see the ulti-

mate terror that will make war so horrible that men will surely create peace. Even Mr. Harrow, speaking of future wars, is moved to romanticism:

> Even here science will render service of a constructive kind, though in an indirect way; for it will so magnify injustice, by inventing any number of death-dealing instruments, that the situation will become too intolerable to be borne, and man will then destroy the roots of the evil.

In this he agrees with Dr. W. Lee Lewis, pacific inventor of lewisite, who recently said:

> Science does make war less adventuresome, less romantic and more deadly. It is, therefore, fundamentally an ally of peace.[25]

Chancellor McCracken of New York University said to the Fourth Mohonk Conference of 1898—sixteen years before the supremely catastrophic World War:

> Military invention also may well be looked to as a powerful factor in aid of peace. When military invention perfects the flying machine, to which my former associate, Dr. Langley of the Smithsonian, is devoting his time, ability and energy, so that it is able to drop explosives of untold power upon any ship, then it seems to me the nations will receive a very strong impulse to the learning of war no more.[26]

Go back further! Thomas C. Upham in 1836 hailed, as an aid to peace, "the great progress which has been made in the various departments of science and the arts."

We know what has also come, not so beneficently, from science; and it is disquieting to find so level headed a writer as Commander J. M. Kenworthy, of the British Labor Party, hoping in 1927 that the airplane (which the booklet on chemical warfare and the naval medical officer speak of as "the method of outstanding promise")

> by making it certain that at any rate amongst the European nations all would be endangered in another war, may rouse the peoples of Europe to the depth of the abyss towards which they are heading."

It is not so simple as all this. With the mobilization of arm-

ament, industry, and science, fear on the part of peoples means nothing else than more of the things of which they are afraid.

We often speak of war as if it were "brute force." It is not brute force. It is man force, highly scientific, organized and civilized and refined to the very garrote point of destructiveness and cruelty.

That is war to-day; war in which, as William G. Shepherd has vividly said, the family won't kiss father good-by; father had better kiss them good-by.[28]

The Mobilization of Government

"The first king," said Voltaire, "was a successful soldier." Not only the first, but most of the rest. Militarism and government have been as inseparable as a pair of tweezers.

Still flushed with the hope of revolutionary democracy, many in the early United States saw here a future freer from militarism than was the case in the war-ridden countries of the Old World. Thanks in part to the lingering force of that youthful prospect, but doubtless more to the natural security of this country's geographical isolation, for many years there was, in some degree, fulfillment; for unlike the closely packed-in nations of Europe, we have not had need, even from the military point of view, of European peace-time universal military service. Indeed, to escape such a hated burden, many thousands of Europeans have flocked to our shores.

Not yet have the modern means of international communication destroyed all of our military security. It has been lessened, and will be lessened steadily. Along with the gradual change, but more than keeping pace, has grown the military mobilization of our government.

"Here, thank God," said the third report of the American Peace Society in 1831, "the arts of peace are substituted for the arts of war."

In a little less than a century, however, government lists of official public documents carried on their back covers this significant sentence about our Federal functions: "The arts of war, as well as those of peace, are actively cultivated."

The extent to which the government has been mobilized for military ends may be seen in different directions. One is in the relation of the military to the civil. A hundred years ago the *General Regulations for the Army* contained an article as follows:

SUBORDINATION TO THE CIVIL AUTHORITIES

1559. Respect and obedience to the civil authorities of the land, is the duty of all citizens, and more particularly of those who are armed in the public service.

When discontent over the corruption of General Grant's administration was mounting, all elements of the population did not share the peace movement's willingness to tolerate such a state of affairs merely because Grant favored the cause of arbitration. The Labor Reformers met at Columbus, Ohio, in February, 1872, where delegates from seventeen states held a nominating convention and adopted a rebellious platform. One plank declared:

14. That we demand the subjection of the military to the civil authorities, and the confinement of its operations to national purposes alone.

Already the use of Federal troops against strikers had become a thorn in labor's flesh, goading it on to reprisals which broke out five years later in our bloodiest year of capital-labor conflict, with actual battle raging in Baltimore, Pittsburgh, Reading, St. Louis, and Chicago.

The request of the Labor Reformers was not granted. A government which had been so thoroughly alarmed in 1877 that four warships were converted into immediate fighting service, and which had already decided in the basic economic contest as to which side its bread was buttered on, could never yield regarding the use of Federal soldiers. Likewise State governments and their militia.

In 1881 the article regarding subordination to civil authorities was officially stricken from the army regulations and has never been put back.

To-day, since the World War, State and Federal forces have

been amalgamated, in all essential respects, in one great military body. On the briefest notice from Washington the National Guard units are made a part of the Federal army. Dating from 1915, the same is true of the Coast Guard. Continually Federal troops go into the States to handle any important disturbance. The intent of the Constitution in this regard is obviously distorted, as that elastic document is stretched in numerous other directions to satisfy official dispositions.

Since 1900 our estimates of available military man power have increased from about 11,000,000 to 18,500,000 (1927), an increase of 66 per cent. Our population, meantime, has increased from about 76,000,000 to approximately 117,000,000 (1927), or only 54 per cent. This figure brings our percentage of possible warriors up to 19.6, highest by far of all nations. If it be argued that the development of machines and the penetration of women into industry has made it possible for more men to absent themselves from productive processes, it is equally true that the same factors operate to increase the military efficiency of the human unit.

The military mobilization of government is further evidenced by the ways in which it spends its money, especially in time of peace.

"Since Washington's day," said Lucia Ames Mead in 1927, "our population has increased 28 times, our area three times, and our expenditures for war 650 times."

Here is a comparison. Savel Zimand, writing in the *New York Times* for April 19, 1925, figured that "Since 1872 the military budget of the United States has increased 2,413 per cent; of France, 1,085 per cent; and of Great Britain, 794 per cent."

All such figures have about them one element of unfairness, in that they do not consider the higher relative cost of war materials and labor in this country and also as time goes on. Nevertheless, they are still appalling when all due allowances are made.

Also, other yardsticks show as vividly the militarization of our government. A table issued November 5, 1921 by the

World Peace Foundation, using Treasury Department reports, revealed that from 1789 to 1920 inclusive, that is, the years of our government since the adoption of the Constitution, total Federal disbursements have amounted to $66,728,209,409, of which the war expenditures of all kinds reach $52,607,489,927, or actually 78½ per cent!

It is debatable that war expenses are a less accurate index of militarization than the cost of peace-time preparedness. Here is light on that. Leaving out all the abnormal war and post-war years, the following table shows what we have been spending on the army and navy.

Year	*Spent On Navy*	*Spent On Army*	*Total*	*Population*	*Per Person*
1820	$ 4,387,990	2,630,392	7,018,382	9,638,453	$0.73
1840	6,113,897	7,095,267	13,209,164	17,069,453	0.77
1860	11,514,650	16,472,203	27,986,853	31,443,321	0.89
1880	13,536,985	38,116,916	51,653,901	50,155,783	1.03
1895	28,797,796	51,804,579	80,602,375	69,471,145	1.15
1905	117,550,308	122,175,074	239,725,382	83,983,421	2.85
1915	141,835,654	172,973,092	314,808,746	98,841,443	3.15
1927	318,909,096	360,808,777	679,717,873	118,628,000	5.73

NOTE: In the above table the population figures for 1895, 1905 and 1915 are only approximate, arrived at by halving the total of the censuses taken five years before and five years later in each instance; the figure for 1927 is the estimate of the Census Bureau. Figures on expenditures up to 1922 include money spent on rivers and harbors but not for the Panama Canal or for civil expenses at Washington; beginning with 1923 figures used by War and Navy Departments include all expenditures except for the Panama Canal.

Again, it is necessary to concede allowances for the rise of prices which makes the purchasing power represented by these figures a bit less striking than the table as it stands. Dun's Index Number, or the wholesale price index in the United States since 1861, shows a rise between 1880 and 1927, from 108.655 dollars to 185.598, indicating that necessary deductions for price increases do not jolt the one fact brought out, namely, a tremendous proportionate increase in expenditure on arms, amounting per person, between 1880 and 1927, when stated in "real" figures, to substantially 300 per cent.

The salary budget for officials of the State Department amounts to $155,800; the Department of Agriculture $178,300;

the Department of Labor $85,100. We have two departments for defense-aggression: the salary roll for War Department officials totals $186,300 and that of the Navy Department $129,200. Thus the last two come up to $315,500, almost twice the amount for the State and Agriculture Departments, and nearly four times that of Labor. It is a duty of the Finance Division of the War Department to watch with care Congress and its appropriation moods:

> The Chief of Finance has also been designated by the Secretary of War as Budget Officer for the War Department, and as such prepares all estimates of appropriations required by the War Department, transmits them to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and presents to him all questions in reference to pending appropriations and legislation which may affect the financial policy of the administration.[29]

Zeal for increased appropriations is not confined to any one department. But there is a difference. Our country can better run the risk of being agriculturized than of being militarized. The annual reports of no peace societies are printed at the expense of all the taxpayers, while the government performs this service for such organizations, for example, as the American Legion, the Boy Scouts, and the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, as well as the D. A. R.; however, copies used by these organizations themselves have to be purchased. All this is not intentionally or even indirectly reprehensible. But it is in line with the whole trend of the century, which has turned our official ambition to be refreshingly different from other military countries into an earnest desire to follow them or lead.

Arms, industry, science, and government—these are the Four Horsemen which ride into a fearsome dawn. They do not ride alone. Behind them march eager ranks of factless, propagandized, mob-stirred millions, goose-stepping to a doom they do not see. They do not know it, but they, too, are mobilized.

CHAPTER XV

THE FIGHT FOR WAR

For what can war but endless war still breed?—JOHN MILTON,
On the Lord General Fairfax at the Siege of Colchester.

CHAPTER XV

THE FIGHT FOR WAR

With the individual, and to a degree with peoples, war has become less popular. Its objectives, with the change to impersonal combat, have grown more abstract and remote. Left to themselves the peoples of uncivilized countries would probably keep from large-scale conflict; only less probably the more developed populations. With the evolution of public sentiment —which after all must not be overestimated—need has arisen for new methods of control. How else might be perpetuated this religion of war, deemed quite as necessary to salvation by its devotees as the scourge to the faithful apologists for flagellation? The inquiring mind, the generous heart, the very bodies of its victims, even, this modern Moloch bends to its bloody, inexorable rites.

The Drive for Man Power

The past century or so, as we have seen, has brought a vast development of weapons for use upon an enemy. The greatest weapon of all is not devised for enemies more than for home populations; it works against the greatest foe of war in every country—the people who might decline to fight. That weapon is conscription.

Its rise, in modern form, was rapid. The eleventh edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* gravely laid down the dictum that conscription "forms even at the present day the chief guarantee for peace, stability, and economic development upon the Continent of Europe." [1] It appears a bad guess, in retrospect, considering that the World War to demonstrate the Continent's

stability began less than four years after! It was hardly the first time, either, that such a demonstration had been made.

Feudalism was accompanied by a general obligation to military service, but even under the feudal system there was nothing approximating modern conscription. It remained for national patriotism to produce this comparatively new invention of the war makers. At the time of the Thirty Years War, Sweden began to raise troops under the so-called Indelta system, by which levies were laid on each district according to its population—a form of conscription "preached in every pulpit in Sweden."

But the use of modern conscription dates from 1793, with the French *levée en masse,* which made it more desirable for the reluctant Frenchman to face the enemy in battle than to confront his own civil tribunals.

Even the *levée en masse* was inadequate in the face of a growing recalcitrance, and in 1798 the famous bill proposed by General Jourdan was put through and conscription for general military service was sprung upon the people of France. It was then possible for Napoleon to snap his fingers at the hated Metternich and declaim, "I can now afford to expend thirty thousand men a month."

Thus in round numbers conscription, like the peace societies, has only recently celebrated its centennial—well in time, however, for the great war of 1914. From 1870 on, practically every European power, with the exception of Great Britain, had settled down to a policy of compulsory army service for shorter or longer terms.

Though men were forced into the service in certain localities during the Revolution and the War of 1812, the United States was slow to take up the European system, even in time of war. In the War of 1812, an attempt was made to conscript the militia of the States into the Federal army; but the law did not get through.

The pioneers of peace were vigorously outspoken on the question. Noah Worcester in 1818 made his opposition plain:

The British impressments and French conscriptions have appeared horrible to the freemen of our country; but similar things on a smaller scale and under a milder name, have been practiced among ourselves. What we have experienced in having men *draughted* and *compelled,* contrary to their inclinations, to join an army, may be regarded as but the beginning of sorrow, unless we abandon the custom of war and adopt a more just, benevolent and honourable mode of adjusting our difficulties.

. . . As a people we should forgive but never forget the step which was seriously proposed for conscription towards the close of the late war with Great Britain. The plan was indeed rejected at that time by Congress; but it may hereafter be adopted.

It was, thereafter, but never completely, sweepingly, ruthlessly, until exactly a hundred years from that protest in *The Friend of Peace.* As true in that later day as earlier, were these other words of Worcester:

And what better is the condition of those who are the victims of conscription for having their lot cast in the United States—in a land of boasted liberty and equal rights? If a man must be a conscript and deprived of personal liberty, without any crime on his own part, why may he not as well be the conscript of one despotism as another? Military conscription is military despotism, by whatever name a government may be called which assumes the power.

A dozen years away from the War of 1812 the twelfth annual report of the Massachusetts Peace Society pointedly referred to the supposed cause of that catastrophe:

Conscription or seduction for recruiting an army, is as really a violation of the laws of Heaven, and of the rights of men, as manning a fleet by impressment.

The post-war appeals for militarization were subsiding in force, and—not seeing far into the future—Joshua P. Blanchard at the thirteenth annual convention of the same society expressed his gratitude:

We have reason to be thankful, that the age when war could be imposed by ambitious rulers on their reluctant subjects, is passing away.

By the combination of short-term enlistments and bounties

in the Revolutionary War, almost 400,000 enlistments were recorded, of which many were duplications; but by 1781 the troops which in 1776 had numbered 89,000 had diminished to hardly 29,000. In his Morristown headquarters General George Washington during 1777 complained bitterly about the "almost incredible" number of desertions, and forbade any furloughs even for his officers.

Out of 528,000 men in the War of 1812, says Colonel P. S. Bond, 465,000 were enlisted for periods of twelve months or less, 400,000 for six months or less, and 150,000 for less than one month.

In the War with Mexico enlistments were abundant, though the hardest fighting of that imperialist raid was done by regular army troops early in the conflict. Short-term enlistments and the bounty were again made use of, but not to such excess. In calling for the volunteers, Congress and President Polk used the words "for twelve months or for the war," a tactical error according to our authority, "thus giving to the men the option of taking their discharges at the end of twelve months if they desired, which they invariably did."

After experiencing difficulty with the voluntary enlistment of fighting forces, the Confederacy in 1862 organized a draft to secure adequate cannon fodder. The North, which had employed chaotically one plan of enlistment after another, with occasionally the bounty, both State and Federal, followed suit in 1863. This, so far as the Union goes, was the first legalization of conscription. The law was acutely unpopular. Draft riots occurred in New York City, Portsmouth (New Hampshire), Boston, and Holmes County (Ohio). Pro-slavery hoodlums and alley gangsters led most of the rioting, which in New York resulted in a loss of life estimated at nearly a thousand by the city police. Behind them, notwithstanding, was a strong public resentment, deep and widespread.

Dr. Ella Lonn, in her study of *Desertion During the Civil War,* after the most careful checking of figures, places the number of actual desertions from the Confederate forces at about

100,000, and those from the Union armies at approximately twice that number. In regard to the Southern situation, she says, "By 1865 desertions were no longer counted by the score, but by the hundred; whole companies, garrisons, and even regiments decamped at a time." It was no different with the troops of the North. On both sides, a regular set of signals were evolved by which soldiers could pass into enemy lines without being harmed.

It is not generally realized that the Civil War draft netted less than 50,000 men and about $10,518,000 under the "three hundred dollar clause" allowing the purchase of exemptions. Of those drafted, 20 per cent failed to report; 30 per cent of those who did report were exempted on account of physical disability; another 30 per cent were granted exemption for various other reasons. Of the remaining 40 per cent about half paid their $300; about two-thirds of the rest hired substitutes; and only the other third went to camp. By Colonel Bond the number actually rendered available through the draft is estimated to be only 36,000. The law was adopted in the first place fully as much to convert the status of the enlisted troops to a "duration-of-the-war" commitment.[2]

The Spanish-American War lasted but 109 days. The United States used 50,000 regular troops and 223,000 volunteers.

Conscription—prettified as "selective service"—became securely fastened upon this peace-crusading country in 1917. Far better than England's our Draft Act worked; for John Bull's broke down sadly in Erin and Australia.

In the defeated countries, conscription was tabooed by the conquerors; some of the victors fastened it upon their people still more securely. Even in countries like Great Britain and the United States, opposed by long tradition to peace-time universal service, conscription as a war policy was written on the books of the war colleges with indelible ink. Should a war soon come, it would find the land of the free and the home of the brave ready with the draft machinery, and no time would be lost in hurling at the foe khaki ranks of conscripts, many of them too young ever to have had a chance to vote on any-

thing, much less on the war itself. "Theirs not to reason why; theirs but to—kill—and die."

In France, where at the Palais Royal, Paris, an early writer in *The Calumet* saw "amazons" who were "dressed *en militaire,* with boots, spurs, and sabre," and where he prayed that "the day might be far distant when such strange sights shall be seen in this country"—in France of 1927, M. Boncour's bill passed the Chamber of Deputies providing for the most drastic conscription, in war time, of every important industry, of all labor, of all persons "without distinction of age or sex." Under its terms the whole country could be mobilized overnight, all civil rights abrogated. Not only in time of actual invasion or attack, be it noted, but in the event of "preparations of an aggressive character." Happily the bill was snagged in the Senate; but of the European turn of mind since the War, it is indeed a vivid suggestion.

Here at home the American Legion, stirred by the great profits piled up by business interests (which were not taxed heavily, as in most of the warring countries) and by high wages (often mythical) received by labor while the conscripts were getting along on comparatively small spending money, sponsored a draft of money and men. Such a universal draft law, prepared for "the next war," would ostensibly "take the profits out of war," and aid peace by depriving war makers of gain.

President Harding endorsed the scheme. Its tangible legislative form was the Capper-Johnson bill. Under this measure it would be possible to draft men into industrial or military servitude; but as far as the drafting of funds is concerned the bill was evasive and ineffective. On the other hand, in respect to the human factor, it made the President a virtual dictator over the lives of millions, and under circumstances inadequately defined. The bill provided

> That in case of war [any kind of war] *or when the President shall judge the same to be imminent* [italics mine] he is authorized and it shall be his duty when, in his opinion, such emergency requires it

(a) To determine and proclaim the material resources, industrial organizations and services over which government control is necessary to the successful termination of such emergency, and such control shall be exercised by him through agencies then existing or which he may create for such purposes;

(b) To take such steps as may be necessary to stabilize prices of services and of all commodities declared to be essential, whether such services and commodities are required by the Government or by the civilian population.

It will be seen at once that this is no genuine "conscription of wealth," such as a direct levy upon income or means. Furthermore the President—or rather the absolute monarch who would then control us—would find it easier to conscript youths, for which there is precedent, than to make the wealthy pay for the war—for which there is no precedent at all.

Under such elusive language, it will readily be seen that our next war President would have a power hitherto unimagined by any despot. Nero, Cæsar—how mortified they must be in their trans-Styxian retreat! Here is one trick they missed. And some have foolishly declaimed, in song and story, the eternal banishment of slavery from our soil in 1865!

The Capper-Johnson bill, successively introduced in Congress, has never passed. Perhaps it never will. Whether it becomes a law or not, it has served to show how far good people may go toward mobilizing the masses, and all in the sacred name of peace. So benign a person as the late Bishop Brent, Vice-Chairman of the Federal Council of Churches Commission on International Justice and Goodwill, once gave this plan his backing.[3] It is supported by the Legion and numerous "patriotic" societies. The American Federation of Labor, on the contrary, stated in its outline of planks for consideration of the parties in the 1928 campaign:

The American Federation of Labor has declared its opposition to compulsory service and compulsory labor under any form or any guise whatever. For this reason, it is opposed to industrial conscription at any time and it is opposed to conscription for army and navy service except in case of a defensive war where citizens are called upon to take arms in defense of the Nation, its territory or its sovereignty.[4]

The Republican Party platform adopted at Kansas City in 1928 declared for this monstrous enslavement in general terms.

How truly the Capper-Johnson measure provided for genuine conscription of wealth is indicated by some frank testimony before the House Military Affairs Committee on May 21, 1928, by Colonel Edward E. Spafford, then National Commander of the American Legion. Representative James inquired, "How are you going to draft capital under your bill?" Said Colonel Spafford, "You cannot draft capital; you know that, sir." When Congressman Garrett wanted to know why, Colonel Spafford responded, "The Constitution of the United States says that you cannot take a man's property without just compensation. . . . To draft capital and take a man's property would be making us into a United States of Soviet America instead of the United States of America." "You cannot take his property, but you can take his life?" asked Representative Speaks, a little later; whereupon came the reply from Colonel Spafford, "Yes, sir; I think everybody recognizes that."

Only a few months after the signing of the Pact of Paris, Representative James, by request of the War Department, introduced a bill (H. R. 2897) providing for the most stringent war-time conscription, in which there is absolutely no mention of conscripting wealth or regulating prices or any attempt to curb a thing beyond the freedom of the citizen from war service.

President Hoover in 1930 signed an act providing for a commission to study the problem of conscription with a view to working out a plan which would be efficient and ready at hand for the "next war" whenever the administration in office at the time decides on hostilities.

Irrespective of this particular measure's fate, certain is it that war-time conscription, long hated and considered profoundly un-American, is to-day an integral, a central part of our mobilization machinery. Here, too, we have been making "progress."

The Drive for Youth

"I pledge a Legion to my flag and to the Republicans, for

which it stands; one nation, with invisible liberty and justice for all." The boy who is reported to have brought home this version of the flag salute could easily be forgiven; for he was doubtless very small.

The capture of the learning process for the inculcation of a military patriotism is reasonably complete. The indoctrination commences early. Innocent words, with a ring of nobility to them, when taken of themselves; but as actually taught and applied to the ways in which the flag is supposed to symbolize our loyalty, it is a rare youngster who does not acquire a standardized form of national fealty definitely associated with warfare. If there is not a standardization about it, if there is not back of its use an accumulation of militarist fervor, why then must it be so serious a matter? Serious it is.

For example take the State of New York. Section 712 of the Education Law makes it the duty of the Commissioner of Education to prepare for the use of the public schools of the State a program providing for salute to the flag and for instruction in its correct use and display. Assuming that the pupils are required to salute the flag in accordance with these regulations, a failure on the part of a pupil to comply would be deemed misconduct. If persisted in, the pupil may, if over sixteen years old, be expelled; or, if within the age of compulsory attendance, may be suspended, with the consent of the Board of Education, for a period of not more than one week. If he still refuses to comply with the regulations, he may be committed to an institution for the detention of incorrigibles.

If this is not conscription of thought, you may name it yourself.

"During the course of a year the War Department guides, for varied periods, the lives of over 400,000 young Americans enrolled in the Regular Army, the National Guard, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and the Citizens' Military Training Camps." This from the 1926 Report of the Secretary of War.

In 1928, high schools in twenty cities gave R.O.T.C. courses which were compulsory. Military training was compulsory in eighty-six colleges and universities. In 1929, 13,134 students

were taking the advanced course of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps in college, while 73,352 young men in 125 colleges were taking the basic courses. The work of the Junior R.O.T.C. in 103 cities netted 43,472 secondary and high school boys. (See a speech by Hon. Ross A. Collins in the House of Representatives, January 10, 1930.)

To what purpose are these courses given? No better summary has come to my eye than that given by Major William W. Edwards, in *The Infantry Journal* for October, 1922:

> The Defense Act has two distinct functions. The first is so obvious as to need no comment, that of training officers and men for the reserve forces; its second function, while not less important, is less apparent, and therefore sometimes overlooked entirely, that of training the popular public mind to the necessity and needs of defense. The Junior R.O.T.C. fulfills the first mission indirectly, and for the second, I believe, there is no greater or better agency at our command. The high school boy in his Sophomore year is in his most plastic and enthusiastic stage.

And with what ideals are these youths being inspired? Good ones, some of them: cleanliness, robust physique, physical courage, orderliness, coöperation. But they are also being militarized. Can anybody deny the truth of it with regard to the youths who heard an R.O.T.C. instructor at Camp Kearney hold forth? Here he goes, in a talk on Military Psychology:

> This is a period of truce. The Great Wars of the world have not been fought . . . watch Asia. . . . Think of the hundreds of thousands of pacifists who work night and day to help our most deadly foreign enemies! . . . If you find a man who is opposed to Universal Military Training for all loyal citizens—watch that man! . . . Gentlemen, I envy you. You are to become military leaders. . . . There will be wars until the end of time. Everlasting peace is for the grave—not for life. The wish for everlasting peace is born of fear and ignorance. It is a sure sign of weakness and a declining civilization. . . . The World cannot be made larger. There are few "new worlds" on this planet. The strong will survive. The weak must perish! Steel your arms and draft your bodies for the greatest war that the world has ever seen!

Here is the R.O.T.C. Manual, Infantry, 2nd year advanced, Vol. IV, 7th edition, August, 1925, page 207:

We live in a world governed by Divine laws which we can neither alter nor evade. And in this world of ours force is the ultimate power.

Ditto, page 384:

During the course of a great war every government, whatever its previous form, should become a despotism.

Again, page 255:

An armistice should never be granted at the instance of a defeated foe. It is a confession of weakness, of inability to clinch the victory.

Once more, page 208:

The mainsprings of human action are self-preservation and self-interest, in a word *selfishness*—the "touch of nature which makes the whole world kin."

A student publication in an R.O.T.C. college printed in 1925 certain extracts from Moss and Lang's *Manual of Military Training* (1923 edition), a textbook with a circulation of some three hundred and twenty thousand. Those excerpts showed how crude was the philosophy underlying much of this training. They are distinctly more robust, you might say, than anything in such a work, for instance, as the *Manual of Bayonet Exercise Prepared for the Use of the Army of the United States,* by General McClellan, issued in 1862. In the face of protest and unfavorable publicity, some of the harsher sentiments and instructions have been deleted and bayonet drill given up in the R.O.T.C. It is revealing to note the quotations picked out by the rebellious undergraduates:

The object of all military training is to win battles.

The principles of sportsmanship and consideration for your opponent have no place in the practical application of this work.

To finish an opponent who hangs on, or attempts to pull you to the ground, always try to break his hold by driving the knee or foot to his crotch and gouging his eyes with your thumbs.

This inherent desire to fight and kill must be carefully watched for and encouraged by the instructor.

America needs invincible infantry.

In my opinion the deletion was unwarranted. War cannot be made gallant or ladylike. If our youths are to learn the lovely art, why not learn it with some semblance of reality?

As far as numbers go, the situation in the United States might be much worse. Defenders of the system often point out, justly, that the youths affected are but a small percentage. How honest an argument this is may be seen from the fact that they are doing their level best to reach ever-increasing numbers, their ambition suffering a curb only from a lack of further financial appropriations.

What the proponents of youth-preparedness really want may be inferred from the *R.O.T.C. Manual for Infantry,* 2nd year advanced, Vol. IV, 7th edition, 1925. Some may want more, some less. In a recent edition a part of the program as set forth is eliminated, but in other books used by the R.O.T.C. the *beau idéal* remains the same:

What constitutes a proper military policy for the U. S.?

(1) A Regular Army of about 300,000 enlisted men and 20,000 officers.

(2) A national guard under complete Federal control, numbering from 400,000 to 500,000 officers and men.

(3) An organized reserve of 500,000 to 1,000,000 officers and men.

(4) An unorganized reserve to consist of:

(a) An officers' reserve corps, to include an unlimited number of individuals qualified as officers, to be drawn from the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and other available sources;

(b) An enlisted reserve. . . . (etc.)

(5) The Reserve Officers' Training Corps in schools and colleges.

(6) Universal military training for young men in time of peace. . . . (etc.)

In a *fifteen-year period,* according to the Committee on Militarism in Education in 1927:

federal expenditures on military training in civil schools have increased from $725,168 to $10,696,504, a fifteen-fold increase; the number of institutions giving such training, from 57 to 223, a four-fold increase; the army personnel detailed to conduct the training, from 85 to 1809, an eighteen-fold increase; the number of students

enrolled, from 29,979 to 119,914 (including voluntary) a four-fold increase.[5]

Professor William Bradley Otis, not a pacifist, testifying before the House Military Affairs Committee said, in 1926:

> Never before, gentlemen, in American history has the freedom of our higher educational institutions been thus threatened by an Army bureaucracy.

It is quite true that some boys, if they do not like the drill, can change their high schools or colleges at will; but they represent only a very small percentage. Most students are helpless about it as far as high schools are involved, and most colleges are selected for definite reasons which are not readily subject to change.

Compulsory military training may not be government conscription, though it is certainly government-fostered. But it is always, invariably, conscription-of-youth-by-Elder-Statesmen which seeks to fasten upon successive generations the same inept military ideals which have ruined the hopes of so many generations in past years.

How the elders fit on the armor by persuasion instead of out-and-out conscription is shown by certain interesting figures.

One figure is 39,676. This is the number of boys who, in the summer of 1927, took the courses of the Citizens' Military Training Camps. The number for 1928 and 1929 was a bit lower. What did they learn? As in the case of the R.O.T.C., some things of value; but none which they could not have learned as well or better in civilian camps. They learned some other things.

Some of the other things were learned from instructors who were following out the teaching suggested by a new *Manual of Citizenship Training*—a normal-school text, in a way—put out in 1927. These other things are not concerned with the handling of firearms or explosives; they deal with the building up of hair-trigger minds.

"I will take any man who is not an absolute idiot and teach him the trade of a soldier in three months." This from John

Philip Sousa, testifying more enthusiastically than deliberately on behalf of a bill favoring commissions for army bandmasters.[6]

The military instructors know better than that. They understand that military matters are technical matters, that cannot be mastered in three months or six or a year. But ideas! One lecture may start a train of thought which, tying in with the whole system of deliberate and unconscious military propaganda by which youth is surrounded, may turn out a "right-minded" citizen with little further assistance.

What is "right-minded"? Let the *Manual of Citizenship Training* work on you a bit. The numerals are mine, an aid to later comment.

> (1) . . . the philosophy of government, as set up under our constitution, finds its key-note in individualism as opposed to collectivism—that misguided philosophy of government which makes the state paramount in its demands over the inalienable rights of its individual citizens.
>
> (2) The American is the personification of independence. He asks no favors of government or men.
>
> (3) What are the principles of democracy? Demagogism, license, impulse, agitation, discontent, anarchy, chaos and socialism.
>
> (4) How can we best provide for the peace and security of our nation? By being prepared, showing that we are at all times ready for war.[7]

In these random examples of the principles on which good citizenship is supposed to rest, (1) is of course intended as a swipe against government ownership. The connection between this subject and military training is obscure, unless it be that if all brands and degrees of socialism are avoided, there may be more need for military preparation—a view which I will hardly attempt to refute. To adhere completely to individualism, however, would involve the government's giving up the Post Office Department, all control of roads and waterways and collective activities too numerous to mention. It would be destructive of morale, I should think, to teach what is obviously true if (1) is correct: namely, that the government is continually breaking the constitution.

If (2) is to be taught, clearly all the C.M.T.C. boys must go home to work against tariffs, which surely are favors from government; not to mention military appropriations for schools.

If (3) may be relied on, every young man who fought for the sacred cause of democracy in 1918 was promoting that combustive combination of irreconcilable concomitants against which the C.M.T.C. authorities would sound a solemn warning —look back and count those awful conditions.

And if (4) is the basis of good citizenship and true Americanism, we are late in arriving at this wisdom. Germany was prepared in 1914; German youth learned how secure preparedness made them. The same is true of Belgium, which had put through one year previously a huge preparedness program. France, Russia, Italy, Britain—all were prepared, though of course in varying degree. An examination of the war losses in men killed reveals the curious fact that fatalities occurred most heavily in Russia, Germany, and France—the very countries best prepared of all.

But such facts do not matter to the blithe assurance of the War Department. The flame is beauteous to the heady moth; your true military zealot never heeds such admonitions as that by Shakespeare's Duke of Norfolk:

> Heat not a furnace for your foe so hot
> That it do singe yourself.

The plastic mind of youth—that is the great objective. And if thought can't all be conscript, then let us reach it all by other means. Such is the plan, deliberate with some, traditional and hardly conscious with others. However motivated, the efforts produce results which ought to be more and more gratifying to the military nabobs.

Where military training is on a voluntary basis, constant federal attention is required. In a letter to the writer answering an inquiry, a naval officer stated:

> It is with satisfaction that we establish a connection with any institution of education, whereby the young people of the coming generation may be reached with data and information concerning any adjunct so important to their country as the Navy.

Probably so. But the navy should be jealous. The army establishes many a connection, and keeps its hold over the students, by argument, patriotic appeal, or if need be, bribery.

A heavy percentage of American college boys are impecunious. Even those from wealthy homes are not always pampered and kept flush with funds. A strong appeal is made to the poorer undergraduate by the free uniform, which saves him expense in clothing bills. Often the student is provided with an "overcoat suitable for wear with both uniform and civilian clothing."

The New Mexico State College *Round-Up,* a student journal, made this plain:

> Advanced R.O.T.C. pays. Whether you juniors believe in military training or not, if you are in need of money you had better take the course. The compensation is nine dollars a month. Besides this, a thirty-six-dollar uniform is given to the advanced student. . . . Some claim that the summer camp is a disadvantage. True they get only seventy cents a day, with board, room and clothing; but most of them make considerable from the transportation appropriation, which is five cents a mile.

The University of Arkansas catalogue declares:

> The total money value of uniform received, commutation of subsistence, rations in kind at Camp, pay at Camp, and transportation to and from Camp for each man who completes the four year course, is about $400.00.

And this not for work outside the course of study, but work for which scholastic credit is granted.

At Yale and other colleges where presumably youth is somewhat more gilded, tailor-made officers' outfits are provided, and the military department maintains for artillery students a stable of polo ponies.

The Department of the Interior in 1927, listed one hundred and thirty-two private military schools in the United States. The ideal on which these schools base their character training is of course the military standard, the war standard, the preparedness doctrine. Only in seven of these is aid directly given (1927) by the government.

Schools where the military work is all paid for by the gov-

ernment total two hundred and twenty-eight; fifty more are government-aided.

The government sends rifle coaches to assist the National Rifle Association of America in its marksmanship contests at Camp Perry.

> For this national meet the expert shots of the army, navy and Marine Corps, the National Guard from every State in the Union and the best marksmen of the various R.O.T.C. units were selected. Usually about 5,000 men in all are in attendance at the national matches. Of this number, about one-half are regulars. about one-quarter National Guardsmen, and the rest civilians.
>
> To encourage knowledge of military arms throughout the nation and to teach civilians how to shoot, the man in civil life is as much desired at Perry as the best shot in uniform. This includes not only the best marksmen of civilian gun clubs, but the ambitious youngster who has never touched a piece in all his life but is eager to learn how to fire. . . . Regular army officers are detailed all along the firing line as coaches and instructors, lending their skilled aid to any civilian in need. . . . During six weeks in the late summer of 1927 five regiments of regulars were at Perry aiding the civilians in every way.[8]

Similarly, the United States Revolver Association, which adopted a resolution in 1924 contending that "the training of the citizens of the nation in the use of arms is a patriotic and desirable object," and which adds realism to this "manly form of recreation" by using as targets a silhouette of the human figure, not only spreads what is basically the military view, but labors faithfully to kill legislation calculated "to hamper or prevent the possession and proper use of pistols and other firearms by reputable citizens, for purposes of protection and defense as well as for practice and target shooting." [9]

The arms manufacturers are active now as they have been in the past. The old Navy League is still on the job though it works less conspicuously than it did during the Navy drive of 1916, when Congressional investigators found that its officials were largely representatives of the big steel, mining and powder interests—including Cleveland H. Dodge, David Low Dodge's great-grandson, who was a life member!

When the President is given the millionth gun made by a

large firearms factory, it need be taken as no sinister gesture. But when the arms companies invade the precincts of childhood, there is reason for concern.

How these companies may go about building a demand for their goods was suggested by a leading editorial in the Winston-Salem (N.C.) *Journal* for November 29, 1926:

> Investigation by Jonathan Daniels, the *Journal's* Washington correspondent, shows conclusively that the movement to establish rifle target-shooting "clubs" in the Winston-Salem High School and other public schools of America was originated by the big arms and munitions manufacturers of this country.
>
> Their object is to create a demand for guns. Their purpose is to instill into the hearts of the youth a desire to shoot.
>
> The Winchester Arms Company alone spent $500,000 in promotion of this insidious and effective propaganda to turn the minds of American schoolboys away from books to rifles. . . .
>
> So far as the *Journal* has been able to learn, the arms manufacturers have made their first assault in North Carolina on the Winston-Salem High School. But other schools are not immune. They should be on the alert. Indeed, isn't it time the State Department of Education was taking a hand to prevent our public-school system from being prostituted to the ideals of Prussianism?

In 1918, a war year, the same newspaper reveals, the Winchester Arms Company organized a chain rifle corps among youth, which recently became the National Junior Rifle Corps, which has grown from five thousand to one hundred and fifty thousand members. Rifles were given away to boys and girls in summer camps of the Y.M. and Y.W.C.A., to scout troops, etc., etc. and medals were given—up to 1920, eight thousand of them.

In 1925, the Winchester people withdrew all control and turned the enterprise over to the National Rifle Association of America. The investment of five hundred thousand dollars, according to a spokesman, did not bring that amount of increased sales, "but it got good will." [10]

A like inculcation of the military ideal is not absent in the Boy Scout movement. The annual reports of this organization state that

As an organization the scout movement is not military in thought, form or spirit, although it does instill in boys the military virtues, such as honor, loyalty, obedience and patriotism. The uniform, the patrol, the troop, and the drill are not for military tactics; they are for the unity, the harmony, and the rhythm of spirit that boys learn in scouting.

And follows an appreciation of "the wonderful record of scout nation-wide civic war service. . . ."

Also follows, later, a statement that

One of the things in which the Boy Scouts of America has been particularly fortunate has been in the cooperation of the various service clubs and of the American Legion. An elaborate plan of cooperation with the American Legion has been worked out, in which the Legion is concentrating on giving out-of-door leadership. Every Legion post has been urged by the American Legion officials to promote a Boy Scout troop.[11]

I make no sweeping condemnation of the peace record of the American Legion. It represents only a minority of ex-service men, and its official point of view has often gone farther than many of its posts toward perpetuation of the militarist philosophy. Certain posts without official rebuke, however, have furnished a permanent memorial to the startling fact that those who ought to learn most from war often acquire no basic understanding whatsoever.

I behold no deep and dark conspiracy against which to exhort. Nevertheless, here are some fair inquiries. Where is the peace society at all consistent in its anti-war record, whose cooperation has been sought, and whose advice followed, by Boy Scout officials? In what peace parade have Boy Scouts ever marched in numbers as they march continually in military and Memorial Day parades? What instructions in the arts of peace are being provided for the education of the Scouts? The Scout jamboree in England was a step toward world friendship; but infinitely more than this is called for.

The Scout officials are sincere, I am convinced, in their effort to keep the Scouts, as they think, "not military in thought, form or spirit," but they are careful to do nothing likely to

alienate the support of military organizations. Certainly in local situations the Scout troops are often subject to direct military influence. A newspaper, for example, prints a photograph of a group of Boy Scouts beside the tomb of the unknown soldier, at a ceremony honoring the only member of their troop who was killed in the World War. Caption: "In Memory of Those Who Preceded Them in Defense of Their Country." [12] Another newspaper prints a photograph of a cup award being made to a Boy Scout troop by an army lieutenant.[13] *Military and Naval America* contains a chapter on the Boy Scouts, and lists the Scouts as a "semi-military organization," along with the National Rifle Association, cadet corps, et cetera, which are "instilling a love of country and the flag and a willingness to fight for them if need be."

The Handbook for Scoutmasters states, "Scout drill is founded on the infantry drill of the United States Army." By an act of Congress the Scouts are permitted to wear "uniforms similar to those worn by the United States army, navy and marine corps." [14]

The annual report of the Boy Scouts is a government document, printed, though not distributed, at public cost, by an act of 1915, a year when the preparedness drive was at its height. In some places Boy Scout troops have taken part in sham battles, and in countless localities have been reviewed by military officers. Permission for army officers to act as scoutmasters was granted, upon receipt of a request from Boy Scout headquarters.

There can be no juggling of this issue. No man, or boy, can serve two masters. He that is not for peace, is against it. Most, it must be confessed, still stand with one foot in the puddle, and one foot in the edge's mud. Let them stand forth and declare themselves in words of crystal clarity! The issue may well be the life or death of the boys now growing up all over the world.

The struggle against conscription of the learning process, against the militarism of youth, has gone on for a century. Just as the arguments we have previously examined were di-

rected against war recurrently, so the defensive contest against this militarist menace has fluctuated up and down the battle-line of the years. Never have the "advocates of peace" napped on this question but what they have been called from their momentary bivouac.

After the Revolutionary War, there was a clamor for more military training. Benjamin Rush met the pleas of military leaders with these words:

> I know the early use of a gun is recommended in our country to teach young men the use of firearms, and thereby to prepare them for war and battle. But should we inspire our youth, by such exercises, with hostile ideas toward their fellow creatures? Let us rather instill into their minds sentiments of universal benevolence to men of all nations and colors.

After the War of 1812, the clamor grew apace. Noah Worcester met it by quoting Herman Boerhaave, the famous Dutch physician, who had said, regarding poisons:

> To teach the arts of cruelty is equivalent to committing them.

But the military system grew. William Ladd called it "but one head of the Hydra, war" and cheerfully thought that

> This evil can, and probably will, ere long, be abolished. . . .

The *Letters of Lillian Ching,* which I have quoted, comment sardonically on the fact that in "this Christian land" "throughout the country the young men spend several days in each year to learn to fight. . . ."

William Jay in 1842 protested that

> The enrolled militia of the United States is 1,503,592. This vast multitude are called from their homes several days each year for the purpose of inspection and drilling.

Often it was with wooden guns that the lads strode round the fresh-mown meadows. It was always with the odor of liquid refreshments a spur to action; and a large part of the ardor stirred against the musters was due to the "drunkenness, profanity, and Sabbath-breaking" they induced.

As time went on and the war fever abated, many states

failed to enforce the militia laws. Where they were not definitely abolished they often fell into neglect. Thus in 1845 George C. Beckwith was saying:

> Most of the standing armies of Europe are in a course of reduction, and our own States are gradually ceasing to require military drills. Everywhere the art of war is falling into disuse. . . .[15]

It didn't fall far. For in another year, the forces which had long been gathering to precipitate the Mexican War had finally had their way.

Again history, Time's eternal parrot, repeats itself. After that war, the jingoes were more active, military training was demanded, and the war-peace feud fought over. The Reverend Charles Brooks, in whose Unitarian pulpit years before the Misses Grimké found an open-minded welcome, led an active prototype of our modern Committee on Militarism in Education. Appearing at Albany in 1851 he argued strenuously and with great ability for a bill to eliminate the militia. Though not directly successful, the efforts of this committee to some extent checkmated the rise of a new military-training movement.

Again this one head of the Hydra seemed scheduled for decapitation. But again there came a war. And again there came in its wake a flood of military fervor commensurate with the Civil War's great bloodshed. President Sears of Brown University labored before the Social Science Association and also before a Congressional committee on behalf of legislation providing for compulsory military training in colleges.

Against this move the then young Universal Peace Union spoke sternly, rapping Dr. Sears over the knuckles in sharp language. They

> felt it their duty to expose this by the following motion: "That we view with apprehension and sorrow this effort by professed christians, to introduce into professedly christian colleges, the art of *man wounding,* and *man killing,* as a scientific and commendable study for youth, and we regard such teaching not only as *anti-Christ,* but as positively immoral and wicked.

This slightly anti-climactic rebuke was followed by a verbal sigh:

> What a strange inconsistency in Dr. Sears—education on one hand for life and happiness, and on the other military spirit for misery and death.

Everywhere, despite all effort, military drill crept into the schools. Boys' brigades spread not only from school to school but from church to church. A score of years; again the nation's temperature dropped; and down at Vanderbilt University "Marse Henry" Watterson of Louisville, one of a doughty line of old-time editors, "denounced the practice of carrying and using weapons."

In Boston, after a hot campaign on both sides, the school committee voted not to put muskets in the city schools for drill, and pledged themselves to keep the spirit of war out of education. While the boys' brigades were persisting and called forth suggestions of substitutes in the form of fire brigades, life-saving corps, mechanics' bands, et cetera; and while President Harrison wrote a letter to the *Century Magazine* approving military drill in the schools—still, things were on the upgrade. A bill introduced into the State Legislature of Pennsylvania, in 1895, providing for military training in the public schools, was successfully opposed by the Universal Peace Union.

Then, once more, came a war. And that war, small as it was by itself, gave us suddenly extensive overseas possessions. Talk arose of naval bases; "Manifest Destiny," hitherto a phrase of pre-Emancipation days meaning the extension of slave power, now took on a significance not yet worked out to its final chapter; and for all these new developments, as well as to satisfy a war lust aroused by the yellow press, our naval appropriations skyrocketed and of course once more the cries were loud for military training.

Now the struggle commenced anew. The Peace Department of the W.C.T.U. printed circulars on "Military Drill," "The Boys' Brigade," "Military Drill in Schools," and "Why Peace

Societies Are Opposed to Military Drill." A short time and the Socialists, never relishing the military so often used against the workers, bitterly castigated our growing militarism. Conservative labor found itself in no better case. Young mill men and mechanics in industrial towns played athletic games in armories and marched around happily, one Company E chanting a parody which reflected the peace sentiment still strong in many homes:

My mother told *me*
That she would buy *me*
A rubber doll*ee*
If I'd be good.
But when I *told* her
I loved a *sold*ier,
She wouldn't *buy* me
A rubber doll—*E!*

And on the morrow, that Company "E" was entrained to hold back strikers protesting gamely a wage-cut flesh and blood could not tolerate. All over the country, in those years of labor war and of capitalist penetration to Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama, the Philippines, the same scenes were repeated. And always in the background there swung, now this way now that, the battle for the boyhood of the nation.

Then came a flank attack. History textbooks, always a source of justifiable concern to the peace movement, took on an even louder tone of arrogance. Josiah W. Leeds wrote a booklet, sold by the American Peace Society, entitled forthrightly, *Against the Teaching of War in History Textbooks.* An inquiry was conducted by a special committee of the Society; a detailed and devastating report was the result: *The Teaching of History in the Public-Schools, with Reference to War and Peace.* This in the good year 1906 or 3 R.T.P. (Roosevelt's "Taking" of Panama). Big Bill Thompson of Chicago and Commissioner David Hirschfield of New York had not then awakened to the nation's danger from good-will histories, but their forerunners stalked the land.

Yet gains were once more made, and there was a shred at

least of reason for the optimism that prevailed. And then took place another little conflict about the year 1914. Perhaps that will help to explain the latest large-scale moves to make the goose-step oust the one-step, dating chiefly from the post-war National Defense Act of 1920.

The most obvious corrective thus obtained from historical understanding is to my mind the suggestion that we have the cart before the horse.

In short, military preparedness, especially its folk-aspect in military training, is far less a cause of war, than war is a cause of all military preparedness.

If there is any truth in this, does it therefore follow that the major attack should be directed against war itself, rather than one of its manifestations? I think it does. War is the enemy; and our most murderous weapons of truth, vision, courage, and organized opposition should chiefly be aimed at the heart of the monster war, not at its horrible forked tail.

It does *not* follow, though, that the peace forces can pay no heed to military training. The perpetuation of war is inherent in that practice, whether voluntary or compulsory. Both species must be fought against with vigor. In many ways voluntary military training has its roots deeper in the popular state of mind and will be the harder to hold back. Compulsory military training, for specific reasons, is more immediately menacing. It is worth recalling that in the World War the countries where conscription and compulsory military training were not strong were the only countries where conscientious objection flourished. This is one great value of the fight against compulsory military training.

Again, if young men can be conscripted in time of peace, it will be easier to conscript them and whole populations in the event of another war.

The struggle must be carried on. But it will always be a defensive campaign, fundamentally, until war, bound and held impotent by other factors, chiefly, remains so long with untried muscles that its sinews atrophy and wither.

For the lesson of history, at least the history of our United States, is this: the greatest cause of war is *war*.

The Drive for the People

"Those who admit that the College of Propaganda at Rome once carried the light of the Gospel to the heathen," writes Harold D. Lasswell, an expert investigator of propaganda, "say that the modern publicity department scatters darkness among the civilized." [16]

Such a publicity department is maintained by the army and navy. For instance:

PRESS RELATIONS SECTION

This section is the central coordinating agency of the War Department with regard to publicity. Through the press it attempts to inform the public what the Army is for, what it is trying to do, and of its problems. It publishes a weekly press review and maintains a clipping service. It plans for war-time censorship, propaganda, the handling of war correspondents, and for a visitors' bureau.[17]

"Penalties of Pacifism," "Preparedness and Peace," "Adequate Provision for National Defense"—these are some titles sent to the newspaper-reading public. Reports of speeches by officers fairly flood the press; everything is written up, from the admonitions about pacifism to great bombing demonstrations. No longer do our military solons confine themselves to matters of tactics; they are out to guide the public policy of the United States, foreign and domestic.

Forced to back up by public criticism, they have rallied to their support such bodies as the army and navy service associations, the Reserve Officers' Association, the Military Intelligence Association, the Military Training Camps Association, the American Legion, the Military Order of the World War, the Military Order of the Loyal Legion, and a host of similar groups; including the Navy League, the National Security League, the American Defense Society, the Better America Federation, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the National Civic Federation, and so on. All of these stand ready

both to appeal for heavy preparedness and to denounce the opposition.

These agencies appear to work coöperatively. Their united capacity is of course tremendous. They can make it impossible for anyone who reads at all to pass a day without the perusal of one form of propaganda or another. Until exposed by Senator Walsh of Montana in the Senate Chamber on February 27, 1928, it had been possible for some of these propagandists to use the government frank for the free mailing of attacks on pacifists.[18]

The "perils of pacifism" have been decried from rostrums widely separated in space and time by different officers employing identical standardized sentences and paragraphs. Though exploded again and again as groundless myths, such a responsible figure as General Pershing, for whom I have always felt great respect, is able to write for the absorption of American housewives the same old innuendoes:

> . . . now we are engaged in another conflict—penetrating and insidious, led by so-called pacifists, demagogues and others who would undermine the foundations of free government. They employ even more dangerous weapons than shot and shell. Through unwholesome propaganda they would lure us into the strange and uncharted sea of internationalism and communism. They would destroy all that we cherish and substitute in its place something of hideous mien.[19]

These wild accusations, couched in generalities, are only the offensive of a campaign to hold this country's nose to the grindstone of the war method. On what stupendous illogic it rests is shown by the same article in two contradictory passages:

> In the World War America gave freely of herself to humanity. We may feel content with the part we played. It was indeed a world-saving work.
> . . . But even now ten years after the greatest of all wars we see in the world the same conditions that have ever led to conflict.

These military spokesmen credit the public with no more discrimination than O. Henry's New Yorkers who "only know this and that and pass to and fro and think ever and anon."

Counting on the crushing superiority of their propaganda machine and the credulity of the people, the military agencies lose no chances. It was conceded in a House debate of 1926 that 5000 more commissioned officers were in service than were needed for the command of troops, with a reserve of 90,000 officers, 40,000 of whom were admitted to be incapable of active war service. For what purpose do they exist as officers? To be seeded among the people; to reach you and help you to a viewpoint the authorities want you to hold.

The universities often help. Yale announced in 1926 a scholarship which carries free tuition and is open to competition to young men attending the citizens' training camps at Plattsburg and Camp Devens.

The motion pictures help. Every person who sees news reels knows that of the eight scenes usually shown two are often, and on some circuits always, devoted to army and navy activities; but not every person knows the extent of the collaboration which so arranges matters.

Pathé News Reels in a single month listed the following titles: British Navy Gobs; Japanese Sea Scouts Train on Government Warships; Boys 6 to 14 Receive Actual Experience in Navy Routine Under Direction of Trained Officers; Non-Rigid Training Ship Makes Initial Flight; 24 Seaplanes Leave Base for Winter Maneuvers; Navy's Nervy Pilots Guide Seaplanes on Hop from Deck; Laying High Power T.N.T. Mines to Try Out Their Efficiency as Part of Harbor Defense; Mines Exploded from Shore Station.

The pacific individual is usually cast, in longer reels, to look like a consumptive or a bomb-thrower.

Will Hays is now a lieutenant-colonel in the Adjutant-General's Department Reserve, and Jesse L. Lasky is a major in the Signal Corps Reserve. If there are enough official titles to go around, movie stars may yet receive a solace for the terrors of the "talkies."

The greatest need of the Big Navy Brothers is a huge merchant marine, and their latter-day propaganda has been focused on that end. There is a certain patness, therefore, in the fol-

lowing letter regarding a film, "Don't Give Up the Ship." This letter was sent out to theater managers by a film board of trade:

> In event you do not wish to use this subject on the dates designated kindly advise, giving us full information as to the reasons why you do not wish to use it, as this has been requested by the Naval Department through Mr. Will Hays, President of the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America. And further, remember this is gratis, the posters are gratis, and again let us draw to your attention the naval recruiting station in your city. They will assist you with flags, weapons and other material that can be used to decorate your lobby. Their own sheet boards will be turned over to you for one sheet of "Don't Give Up the Ship" with the name of the theatre on it. Kindly advise if the above meets with your approval and, if not, let us know the reason. Yours for a greater Navy and 100 per cent representation of the showing, "Don't Give Up the Ship."[20]

And radio—what more could any ardent military-methodist hanker for than is ready to his hand? Upon every holiday when there is the least excuse military and naval spokesmen have access to the public ear, and often when excuse is lacking. The more powerful the station the more certain it is that preparedness is continually kept alive. The United States Army, Navy and Marine Bands have contributed no small amount—as their sponsors are well aware—to the creation of a satisfactory public opinion. To the formation of an Army Music School notable musical instructors lent their aid, just as scientists and others have unquestioningly given theirs for different purposes. In 1911 the New York Institute of Musical Art placed ten free scholarships at the disposal of the War Department, to train army musicians for band leadership. In 1928 announcement was made that

> Army bands and orchestras have reached such a state of musical excellence that the War Department has recently closed its Washington school. . . .[21]

Military bands, supposedly for the soldier's morale, are fully as much for the morale of the band-loving public.

One of the recent devices for holding the people in line is Navy Day. Mobilization Day was short-lived, thanks to a hos-

tile church, labor, and peace-group leadership; but its older, brinier brother still performs its annual task of making popular opinion seaworthy. According to a navy release:

> Navy Day was first sponsored in 1922 by the Navy League of the United States, a volunteer association of individuals, who seek to place information concerning the Navy before the public, and since that time the official approval and cooperation of practically all patriotic and veterans' organizations have been offered in support of the observance of the day.

October 27 was selected for the event because it was the birthday of Theodore Roosevelt, who had done so much to build up a large navy. It was Theodore Roosevelt the younger who, as Acting Secretary of the Navy wrote acknowledging the Navy League's suggestion, in 1922 (the same year which signalized the leasing of Teapot Dome and the Elk Hills Basin to Doheny and Sinclair):

> Your idea is sound in every way. I think it particularly good because of certain physical conditions we have in the country. The people of the seaboard are reasonably familiar with the Navy. They see the great ships. They know the Navy men. In the interior of our country it is, however, a different story. The people of Kansas and Oklahoma do not get the opportunity for first-hand information that their fellow-countrymen of California and New York do. They do not realize that the Navy serves them equally with the people of the seaboard. I hope you will make an especial endeavor to familiarize the citizens of our great inland states with the everyday service their Navy does for them. The Navy will be glad to cooperate with you in any way it can. . . .[22]

Not to be outdone, the War Department announced early in 1929 that April Sixth would hereafter be Army Day, to be celebrated by parades and displays. The purpose of such a Day was "to foster a clearer, more intelligent and more sympathetic understanding of the land forces of the country."

There are Days and days. Through them all runs a constant use of military symbolism. The flag, symbolizing the romance and splendor of historic battles, somehow catches no gloomy reflection in its bright folds to show what warfare actually is. The Massachusetts Legislature in 1927 appropriated five thou-

sand dollars for the restoration of the State's historic flags of war. If a flag code becomes Federal law as provided, say, in the so-called Brand bill, saluting the flag whenever it passes may be compulsory to all. Even if this proviso be dropped, a standardization will result calculated to achieve a national mind-set toward the religion of patriotism. What a flag code might do is illustrated by the experience of our 1928 Olympic Game team in Holland. In a parade before the Prince Consort all national flags were dipped as a mark of courtesy, except one—the Stars and Stripes. The reaction of the Dutch was immediate, and a coolness became apparent toward Americans. Who shall say it was not merited?

Only a callous, unimaginative dullard could fail to understand the glamour of war flags and relics to those who ran grave risks to bring them back victorious. But only those who are incapable of seeing plain facts can fail to appreciate the important social effect of war relics, especially on youthful minds.

Ten years after the World War a great Sunday-school supply house was selling buttons to stimulate attendance records, depicting a soldier with poised bayonet leaping into an enemy trench, and bearing the legend "Over the Top."

Cannon that stand on countless village greens speak with an accent in peace time less gutteral than in war; but the language is the same. Looking back, we find *The Advocate of Peace* in 1840 saying:

> The building of battlefield monuments—and will Bunker Hill monument be regarded as an exception?—seems to arise from the same element of our nature which prompts the Indian to preserve the scalps of the enemies whom he has slain.

We have in this country an active Battle Monument Association; but there are hundreds of them traveling under other names. Every body of veterans, every town council, every civic improvement society almost, it appears, is bent on holding to the gaze of untold generations the things they want them *told*. Looking back on the bloody years and bitter decades that followed the Sumter episode, it seems a strange impulse that

prompts the erection of a Sumter memorial flagstaff in our day. Equally odd in the sight of that angelic tourist described by Franklin to Priestly would seem the erection, at government expense, of a monument to the Battle of Long Island.

All over the country, however, the surveys of battlefields continue, the erection of granite obelisks goes on. Sometimes a war memorial is removed; but such instances are rare.

Late in 1928 the War Department predicted that under the new act approved May 26, providing for the loan or gift of World War relics to soldiers' monument associations, Grand Army of the Republic posts, State museums and municipal corporations, a shortage would speedily develop of captured field pieces and other trophies. More green lawns will bear these hideous blooms of hell, and more minds will be indoctrinated with the fiendish Great Gun Gospel.

The town of LeRoy, New York State, had the sense and courage in 1926 to bury in the soil of its parks two huge Revolutionary cannon; but such news is rarer than that of the man who bit a dog.

The shrine of the Unknown Soldier is a symbol doing its grievous share, perhaps, to create more Unknowns in Unknown wars to come. Lindbergh, the great Known to all, was captured by pursuit planes of the army's press bureau, and the whole world knew that "he was army trained." Even the old ship *Constitution,* rehabilitated for its trip along the coasts and through the inland waterways (and in part by funds raised through the use of franked envelopes by the navy), bears a mute testimony to the glory that was grease and the grandeur that was gore. Or, it may be, as stated in *The Mission and the Needs of the United States Navy,* published by the same:

> Thus it will be possible for great numbers of grown people and children to see this relic of old times, to realize her history and battles, and feel the inspiration of her presence. To them she will represent sea power, the protection of merchant vessels and commerce, the establishment of freedom on the sea.
>
> . . . The lessons of the early history of this country and the demonstration of the value of sea power by the *Constitution,* are lessons in good citizenship, of great spiritual value. And these

lessons furnish an effective antidote to radical subversive doctrines in schools and among the people.

There are vast possibilities for the reservoiring of emotion behind such symbols, as the professional war-advertisers well know. But greatest of all as sales talks are the vast dramatic demonstrations of war machinery with none of war's effects.

All the artillery booming and machine gun fire in a sham battle between 18,000 citizen soldiers at Camp Henry Knox, Ky., will travel through the ether tomorrow night in an attempt to broadcast by radio from a battlefield, under direction of the United States Signal Corps. Citizen soldiers from three States will repulse an "enemy attack" and the progress of the warfare will be related over the radio by Col. Mark E. Hamer.[23]

And here is drama:

An attempt to "capture" this city will be made today by a theoretical army which has landed on the New Jersey coast during the last few days and has driven back the advance guard of the defending forces of the city and is now massing for an attack on Staten Island.[24]

And here:

While in Westchester the soldiers will enact seven realistic demonstrations showing how an enemy air attack would be repelled, bringing into play the latest type "archies" or anti-aircraft guns. . . . In the air raid demonstration, a huge searchlight with a beam of one million candlepower will be employed to "spot" imaginary enemy airmen. Approach of the theoretical aviators will be recorded by a highly intricate sound-detecting apparatus located on the ground near the guns. . . . For the first time a public demonstration of the army's new 50-calibre anti-aircraft machine gun will be given.[25]

Just stack this up in emotional appeal against the demonstration of a new peace proposal, proffered to the public by the people who have been described by the dramatist, Percy MacKaye, as those who

read dry pamphlets in separate homes, or in offices to the clicking of typewriters, or at best . . . gather chaotically together in a rented hall, listening to drab-coated talkers from a platform, or

waving drab handbills for rallying banners. Drab—that is their disease. Their dreams are more glorious than the dreams of war; their dreams are incarnadine, flushed with fighting angels; but they clothe them—and they stifle them—in drab.[26]

Is this the fault of the peace movement? No; for that movement cannot afford to put on such displays.

Is this the fault of the peace movement? Yes; for it has too scant excitement to put on. There is drama in peace effort of a radical kind; but from that sort of effort the peace movement flees as from a plague.

It is enough to query who, in such a competition, is the certain winner, for the answer is but automatic. Thus equipped, reënforced by traditional emotion, sponsored by clever men who know how to extract from their gaudy toys the last ounce of unrealistic appeal, it is not strange that the mobilization of arms, industry, science and government is being matched and sustained by a vast mobilization of popular thought and feeling.

Left to themselves, the people want no war and no war truck or trappings. Left to themselves, however, they cannot be.

Is all of the foregoing merely a repetition of the old complaint against propaganda which in a previous chapter was classed as a skirmish in the fight for peace? Perhaps it is; but there is a difference, clearly, between a whipping up of popular opinion by newspapers which for sensationalism drive governments into war, and the deliberate official and semi-official use of every conceivable agency by what are nothing else than vested military interests. A military officialdom bent on efficiency to carry out the public will is also very different from a vested interest determined to use its power in order to create an overwhelming demand for more of the same vast power. That road when tried elsewhere has in the long run led to war.

How far we have traveled in this Via Dolorosa is suggested by a recent newspaper comment:

> The most astounding part of it is that we Americans are becoming infected with the European spirit.
>
> We are not only glad to scrap our beautiful dreams but we display a new and surprising interest in military subjects.

There never was a time, perhaps, when the news dealt more generously with war scares and war possibilities, when the magazines were so filled with war stories and war articles and when one could see so many movies depicting war romances.

Shall we attribute this to natural reaction or take it as a sign that America has fallen in step with the Old World she professed to disagree with and is about to adopt a more aggressive policy?[27]

We may attribute it to the new power of mobilization. The masses are being used. They are being used to the limit of saturation by earnest madmen who learn nothing from the tragic blunders of humankind except the art of moving the world toward their ultimate repetition.

CHAPTER XVI

RIVAL TACTICS OF THE EARLY YEARS

The armies of peace, like the hosts of war, must have an advance guard, a forlorn hope, which may fall while leading the way to assault and victory. But in this, as in other cases, the post of danger is the post of honor. And who would not wish to share that honor? Who, after the glorious victory shall be won, will not wish to have been among the few who first unfurled the consecrated banner of peace?—EDWARD PAYSON, 1782-1827.

CHAPTER XVI

RIVAL TACTICS OF THE EARLY YEARS

Most of those in the peace movement have found it possible to support every war. Each war has been steadfastly opposed by a handful; at times some of the movement's leaders have been uncompromising. But an overwhelming majority in the rank and file have always subordinated their peace loyalties to the war cause and have been against all wars excepting the ones that have occurred.

For this inescapable fact the reason must be sought primarily in the peace-time tactics of the movement itself. What those tactics have been can be understood only by an examination of the sincere rivalry within the movement, of different ideals, personalities, and social principles.

"The long night of darkness, delusion, and war is far spent," Noah Worcester asserted in 1818; "the reign of light and love and peace is approaching." The almost millennial hope of Worcester is something hard to account for in view of his incisive intellect; but it makes his justification of defensive war the easier to understand.

David Low Dodge, on the other hand, was never guilty of a facile optimism. A radical on war, he looked forward with a more accurate vision, however reluctantly he faced the prospect.

David Low Dodge—Radical Pacifist

The "father of the peace movement" was a stout conservative in religion, in economics, in morality, in parental authority. In regard to war his was an untamed opposition.

The publication of his anti-war tracts was a startling challenge to accepted military orthodoxy. Unlike Ladd, who entered the peace movement as a middle-of-the-road peace advo-

cate and gradually adopted a more drastic position, Dodge in his first pacific steps put both feet down firmly against all varieties of warfare. It was not a post-war period that witnessed the appearance of his writings, it was a time of gathering warlike bitterness. How few were the outside influences which impressed upon him the pacifist view, he later on attested. Like Francis of Assisi, he dated his conversion from an illness:

> Until 1806, when I moved from Hartford to New York, I do not recollect that I ever found an individual but what advocated defense with carnal weapons. In New York I met with two persons, beside those who belonged to the Society of Friends, who advocated pacific sentiments. I continued my inquiries and investigations until 1808, when I was visited with the spotted fever, and was so low that two doctors told me I should probably live but a few hours. In this situation, my mind was calm and lucid. The question of war and self-defense came in review before my mind, and, in the light of the gospel, I had not a remaining doubt of the unlawfulness of all kinds of carnal warfare.

There is a biographical method which sees the cause of every deviation from standardized attitudes in some kind of abnormal mental state. Lest any such practitioner ascribe Dodge's pacifism to a depressed mental condition due to illness, I lose no time in saying that there had been earlier incidents which undoubtedly exerted an influence on his thinking.

For that matter, his mind remained alert. When his doctors advised against his plan to take warm baths, he overrode them and was benefited; whereupon they began to use this treatment successfully with other cases. It was during an unexpected relapse suffered at Litchfield, Connecticut, that his narrow escape occurred. It appears to be a wonder that he survived, for there was not a single "bathing tub" in the town; but he hastily devised a water-tight box which was built for him to order and immediately brought a gain in his condition!

He had been born of stock with military records; as a young man in Windham County, one of Connecticut's most war-revering strongholds, he had served as lieutenant in an artillery company for whose cannon his father had fashioned the wheels. He had, however, as a boy seen his two older half-brothers

enticed into the Revolutionary army at the ages of fourteen and sixteen, respectively, by a man who had been promised a captaincy if he could obtain forty enlistments. Dodge writes touchingly of these fair-haired lads whose long sufferings followed by their death during the later years of the war all but drove his mother insane.

He describes with neither scorn nor self-righteousness the men who returned from the Revolutionary conflict demoralized and dispirited and "were generally addicted to low gambling, profanity, intemperance, and widely diffused a most unwholesome moral influence, which we might naturally expect as the fruits of war." He recalls the almost ludicrous sham fights with mock Indians staged in the military musters. And seared into his memory forever was the experience he once had while traveling and stopping at an inn, when in the night he narrowly escaped shooting the tavern keeper upon mistaking him for a burglar.

It was the fashion in those days to avoid trouble by signing pen names to controversial documents. William Ladd, partly from modesty and partly for prudential reasons, employed a score of pseudonyms. His more important series of essays were published as signed by "Philanthropos," and he often used such names as "Spectator," "Pacificator," "Justice," "Philo-Pacis," or "Philanthropist." Other writers on peace wrote as "Eirenikos," "A Poor Man's Son," etc.; Samuel Whelpley's public cognomen was "Philadelphus," and Noah Worcester, chiefly to satisfy the fears of his printer, consented to sign his stirring *Solemn Review of the Custom of War* with the innocuous "Philo Pacificus." A saber-rattling, pro-war pamphlet published in Dodge's bailiwick just prior to his own first tract, and called *War or No War—Introduced with a View of the Causes of Our National Decline* [sic] *and Present Embarrassments,* was signed "Lycurgus."

Dodge, also, launched his first bold tract under the authorship of "An Inquirer." The polemics which followed it, with blast and counter-blast, however, soon drew him forth from anonymity. In the open, with undiminished boldness, he hacked away

at the sacred ikons of the patrioteers. His later writings, for example *The Kingdom of Peace under the Benign Reign of Messiah,* were perhaps a bit more carefully scrutinized, at his request, by various members of the New York Peace Society—such men as the Reverend Samuel Whelpley and his son the Reverend Melanchthon Whelpley, the Reverend Eleazer Lord, the Reverend H. G. Ufford, and the Reverend Doctors E. D. Griffin, E. W. Baldwin and M. L. Parvine.

Save when the duty of parental authority was involved or some public lapse outraged his moral sense, Dodge had a mellow disposition. He was intense with devotion to a multitude of humanitarian causes. His autobiography points an ideal he held up to himself:

> . . . Intelligent piety is calm, contemplative, and seeks by prayer the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the way of duty. Such a course is not inconsistent with being zealous in a good cause or ardent in endeavors for the salvation of souls.[1]

Of that, Dodge himself was a living proof. He was no temporizer. Striding into the middle of a most ticklish subject, he even queried the wisdom of the Revolutionary Fathers:

> In fact, the great barrier to our progress was the example of our fathers in the American Revolution. That they were generally true patriots, in the political sense of the term, and many hopefully pious, I would not call in question, while I consider them as ill directed by education as St. Paul was when on his way to Damascus.[2]

The resentment of war zealots and the alarm of conservative "peace men" can be understood when Dodge's clear-cut pacifism is studied through his own expression of it. His theoretical position on "defensive" war has been quoted in an earlier chapter. Here is his fearless application of it:

> Offensive war, by all professing Christians, is considered a violation of the laws of Heaven; but offensive war is openly prosecuted by professing Christians under the specious name of self-defense. France invaded Spain, Germany, and Russia; England invaded Holland and Denmark; and the United States invaded Canada, under the pretense of defensive war.[3]

David Low Dodge was born on June 14, 1774, in what is now Brooklyn, Connecticut, and died on April 23, 1852, in New York City, after stating with quiet conviction in the morning, "I shall go home to-day." His was a mind of strange alliances, and yet no cause ever had a founder of greater loyalty, nor one with a more flaming passion to see and proclaim the whole truth, impatient of all equivocation. To the end his principles of non-violence possessed him utterly, and he could traffic with no part of any war at all.

Near-Pacifist: Noah Worcester

More than the New York Peace Society, the organization in the Bay State catered to the patronage of the eminent. Its leaders were often men of intellectual, political, and religious repute. College presidents, legal lights and political idols were all fish for Noah Worcester's net. Among those who met in Channing's study were President Kirkland of Harvard and the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of the Commonwealth. Inevitably, such a policy brought into the Society some who were attracted as much by the respectability of its sponsors as by the appeal of the cause.

Yet never were these really representative; still too unpopular was the very thought of anti-war activity. Worcester himself markedly combined a quill of vitriol with a hesitancy to accept a radical pacifist position, especially since the latter in his day was invariably an accompaniment of religious literalism which he as a liberal found hard to stomach.

Like many another person of sturdy speech, Worcester shrank from the open hostility of important people. He never desired classification as an ally of the radicals who refused to perform military drill, once going so far as to deny them access to the peace movement through the pages of his journal. He was a man of indubitable courage, but always something of a stage manager who prized the power of attraction over the populace wielded by star actors.

But if he ever remained a little cautious about adopting thoroughgoing anti-war positions, he knew no hesitancy when

it came to attacking the citadels of war-upholding churchdom. He took a savage relish in pointing out the ludicrous alarums sent up over the uncivilized customs of backward peoples. When infanticide was a subject for horrified gestures in earnest pulpits he hastened to pillory the churches in this wise:

> The more enlightened people called Christians, do not thus destroy their *female* infants. The very thought of doing this would fill them with horror. They have, however, another custom which is esteemed very honourable. They train up many of their *male* children in habits of vice that they may become heroic and dexterous *man-killers*.[4]

With all of such biting sarcasm went a true humility which endeared him to all who knew him, including both those who deprecated his boldness and those who deplored his persistent approval of "defensive" wars.

When he printed letters in *The Friend of Peace* he scrupulously cut out any portions expressing tributes to his personal labors. He was a Congregationalist of strong liberal convictions, who had edited *The Christian Disciple* and had once published a *Solemn* (Worcester, in common with most disputants of the time, became "solemn" when acting as mouthpiece for the Deity) *Reason for Declining to Adopt the Baptist Theory and Practice in a Series of Letters to a Baptist Minister.* Nevertheless he came to see that if peace could be hoped for among nations, it was almost as possible to conceive of it between religious sects. Therefore while editing *The Friend of Peace* he brought out some pamphlets intended to aid interdenominational harmony. "Party spirit," he said, "is the principal obstacle to the progress of pacific sentiments"; and he felt that "Party Spirit among the different denominations of Christians, is but the War Spirit in a modified form. . . ."

Noah Worcester was born in Hollis, New Hampshire, on November 25, 1758. On December 2, 1828, having seen the American Peace Society's federative program accomplished, he laid down his "arms" and retired from active leadership. He lived for ten years more, as devoted as ever but with his hands off the movement. Upon his retirement he wrote to the Society he had founded:

More than thirty years ago, from what I had witnessed, I formed the opinion that old men are often unapprized of the decay of their mental powers, after the fact had become obvious to their friends—and that too frequently they wish to retain responsible situations, when others believe that they would evince greater wisdom in leaving those situations to be occupied by men of more vigor. Having formed this opinion, I then resolved to profit by it, should I be spared to old age.

I have now passed the boundary of "three score years and ten"; my former resolution has occurred with force to my mind, and I have felt it to be a solemn duty to reduce it to practice. I have therefore determined to discontinue my labours as Editor of the Friend of Peace. For several years I have wished to retire; but I saw no one disposed to take my place or to continue a similar work.

The elderly leader went on to rejoice at the appearance of *The Harbinger of Peace,* published by the American Peace Society, and continued his valedictory:

The objects of the Society are still dear to my heart, but I have become too infirm any longer to sustain, without injury, the cares and responsibilities attached to the offices with which the Society has honored me for thirteen years. . . .

The Friend of Peace, from its commencement, has been printed at my own expense and my own risk—having never charged the Society with any copies except what have been distributed for it—just as I charged the copies purchased by other societies or individuals; always taking on myself the risk of selling the overplus copies. But without the patronage of the Society, and the contributions of friends, I could not, with safety, have continued the work one year. . . .

I entertain a cheering hope that my retiring from the responsible situations, which, perhaps, I have too long occupied will be so far from retarding the progress of the society, that it will occasion an addition to its members, its strength, its activity, and its success.[5]

In its write-up of Channing the *Encyclopedia Britannica* states that a sermon against war preached in 1816 resulted in the organization of the Massachusetts Peace Society. Unquestionably, Channing greatly influenced Worcester; but on this subject the truth was the other way around, the Society antedating the sermon. Channing's biographer, John White Chadwick, says of the great Unitarian, "The Peace Society

of Massachusetts was instituted in his own parsonage, and of all his personal tributes, that to its secretary, the Reverend Noah Worcester, preëminently the peace advocate of his time, has the accent of profoundest admiration." Driving once with a friend at Newport, and discussing a non-resistant pamphlet written by Samuel J. May, Channing had clenched his featherweight, pale fist and cried, vehemently, "Brother Farley, sometimes we *must* fight!"

The Massachusetts Peace Society, which believed in one more kind of war than the radicals did, took an official position strikingly less bold. In its constitution it declared that

> We wish to promote the cause of peace by methods which all Christians must approve—by exhibiting with all clearness and distinctness the pacific nature of the gospel and by turning the attention of the community to the nature, spirit, causes, and effects of war.

With a program like that, the Society was beaten before it started. How far it could go toward approving war with such a platform may be seen from the speech made to the Society in 1820 by the Honorable Josiah Quincy, legislator plenipotentiary of the adoring Federalists, who had indeed opposed the War of 1812. The Congressman who was later to be President of Harvard said, with "martial logic":

> Even our militia system, although regarded by many zealous advocates of peace as stimulating war, is, in fact, the most powerful means of preventing its recurrence. In the present condition of the world [sic], a well-appointed militia is unavoidable, in every state, which would escape the necessity of "a state of soldiery professed." The right to defend its own territories against actual invasion is the last, which society can permit to be questioned.

Fifty years later Henry Ward Beecher was to proclaim the same sentiments and also in the name of peace. And in the name of peace they are proclaimed to-day.

Noble though he was, Noah Worcester must share some of the responsibility for this argument's perpetuity. His influence was great, and though he did not agree with such views

as those of Quincy, the official attitude he had urged led directly to their spread.

Ladd paid Worcester a glowing tribute:

> No one, on this side of the Atlantic, has done so much for the cause of peace, as Dr. Worcester. His "Solemn Review of the Custom of War" had an irresistible effect on all who read it. No modern tract has had a greater circulation, both in Europe and America, or has been translated into a greater number of languages, perhaps excepting a few religious tracts.[6]

In terms of immediate influence, Worcester was indeed supreme. At this time Dodge had ceased the output of literature and of course his radical attitude automatically reduced the size of his following however high it was in intellectual clarity. The peace society in Warren County, Ohio, second in order of formation, grew to four branches with a hundred members or more, chiefly Quakers, but distributed the writings of Dodge, Worcester, Ladd and others without creating either new ideas or policies, or lending any appreciable vigor to the enterprise.

In a later chapter some reasons will be suggested as to why the radicals made it none too easy for careful thinkers to espouse their view; the moderates had good reason, sometimes, for their caution, entirely apart from the specific issues at stake. Yet the same essential forces were operative then that have served to guide men's minds these hundred years. Always the social rewards and satisfactions bend to those who can announce, "I am for peace, and yet . . ." Says Edwin D. Mead, with understanding:

> This famous essay of Worcester's represents the platform of the great body of American peace workers for a century, the position of men like Channing and Ladd and Jay and Sumner; but to a non-resistant and opponent even of self-defence like David Dodge, these seemed the exponents of a halfway covenant.[7]

In view of the rush to get on the war bandwagon that has so often characterized the peace movement as a whole, "halfway" seems almost too generous an adjective.

William Ladd: Pacifist-to-Be

Windham County, Connecticut, was not only the abode of a flamboyant militarism; it was the home of a live peace society, led for a time by Samuel J. May, whose peace work seems all but unknown despite his fame as an abolitionist. The Windham County Peace Society as a group stated in its constitution, "Although as a Society we do not denounce *defensive* war, we are cordially united in opposition to all *offensive* or *aggressive* wars." Their report for 1832 is lugubrious about the support vouchsafed to peace work, but rejoices at the "marvellous change wrought in the opinions and habits of our people respecting the use of ardent spirits." The Hartford County Peace Society also justified *defensive* war, and the same is true of most others.

William Ladd held the same opinion, and had written *The Christian Register* to allay the fears of a suspicious public:

> It is thought that the views of Peace Societies are in general extreme; that they condemn as unchristian, every species of self-defence, national or individual, and recommend a passive non-resistance, which would offer up a sacrifice of every right and comfort to the aggressions which, it is premised, are ready to approach from all around if thus invited.
>
> To this belief, it is sufficient to reply, by a simple denial. Whatever may have been the authority upon which particular individuals may have drawn from Scripture or elsewhere, to disclaim the right of self-defence,—few Peace Societies anywhere, and none in this country, have assumed this ground in their collective capacity. It is believed that the great majority of their members are in fact of a different opinion; and they meet and act on the common belief, that offensive war may be prevented, by measures, which will render the recurrence to self-defence, and the question respecting it, quite unnecessary.

Ladd had good reason, based on a disillusionment over the failure of one idealistic venture earlier in his life, to be skeptical over "extreme" positions; and more basic still, his nature was not that of one who could insensitively withstand the assaults of critics. A bit of a glad-hander, a man who was a good manager of affairs and knew it, he did not see any-

thing to be gained by an espousal of radical views. The time came when he did, and then he did not flinch; but he could rarely escape entirely from a tolerant sympathy with opposing ideas, and was not cast for the part of fiery champion.

William Ladd [8] was added to the unexcited population of Exeter, New Hampshire, on May 10, 1778. When he was seventeen his family moved to Portsmouth, where a lichened monument now stands in memory of his career. He was sent to Exeter Academy, and thence to Harvard, graduating, as was not uncommon then, at the age of nineteen. His father was a prosperous shipowner, and after leaving Harvard Ladd went to sea on one of the paternal vessels as a common seaman. Disappointing his parents' hopes that he should become a physician, he stuck to the sea and in a year and a half was a full-fledged captain.

When he married a London girl, Sophia Ann Augusta Stidolph, a more domestic career lured him to try his luck at Savannah as a merchant; he did not stay long there, but moved on to Florida. He raised cotton and owned slaves, a fact which burned into his conscience until at length he set out to strike at slavery by the fantastic—and issue-dodging—scheme of importing European labor. His plan fell flat and his pocketbook was in much the same sad case.

His father died in 1806, adequately rectifying this pecuniary condition, and William once more plowed the seas, until driven from them by the War of 1812. Thereupon he went to reside on a many-acred farm where his father had lived at Minot, Maine. In the old white homestead on the Minot hilltop most of Ladd's pacific projects were conceived. A contented agriculturist he would very likely have remained to the end of his days if he had not been contaminated by "the peace folly."

The infection accomplished by President Appleton and later developed to a fever by Noah Worcester plus Ladd's own fertile brain, never left him; from that time until his lips grew cold in death his veins never ceased to carry the warm blood of devotion. He could no more be cooled by discouragement,

as he once said, than a volcano could be subdued by throwing snowballs into its crater.

His active peace work began in 1823, with the writing of the essays of "Philanthropos." He gave life to the Maine Peace Society and took the initiative in planning the amalgamation of some fifty peace groups which culminated in 1828 with his election as General Agent of the American Peace Society.

Before him now stretched thirteen years of life—years filled with opportunities but also titanic obstacles. During that time there was no war against a foreign foe; but there were frequent slaughters of the first Americans, there was almost a war with France, and sharp conflict over the northeastern boundary. It may have been true, as Madison had said, that "the most noble of all ambitions is that of promoting peace on earth and good-will to men"; but if so, it was news to the general public.

Nevertheless, one of the measures of a prophet's effectiveness is the number of lives set on fire by his words and deeds. And just as Worcester sired Ladd, so Ladd fathered a goodly company of the faithful. Among these were Andrew Preston Peabody, Thomas C. Upham, George C. Beckwith, William Watson (Hartford leader), Thomas S. Grimké, and Charles Sumner. Despite Josiah Quincy's sentiments on preparedness, his address had moved Sumner, who, at the age of nine, had heard it; and a lecture by Ladd shortly after Sumner had gone through Harvard, sharpened his conviction as one puts a point on a hitherto useless pencil. When Sumner stood forth in 1846, five years after Ladd's death, and, fearlessly looking down on rows of gay uniforms, shocked Boston by his sensational address on "The True Grandeur of Nations," Ladd spoke through him.

But Ladd, struggling against an overwhelming lethargy, was forced to say, in 1833:

> We hesitate not to confess, that our pacific principles are not in our vicinity or elsewhere, either so greatly or so rapidly advanced, or so fully admitted, as we could wish; or as we had reason to expect, or as we may have led others to anticipate.[9]

The bulldozing of France by Old Hickory and the stubborn disregard by the French of their obligations owing the United States from spoliation and ship seizures ever since their war with Britain, had almost precipitated open combat; but Jackson was restrained by economic realities and a threat of unconquerable division politically. Ladd sought to take credit for this on behalf of the peace societies; but this claim rested on facts thinner than gossamer.

To be sure, new groups were springing up to propagate the peace idea; young men were responding fairly well in Lane Seminary, Amherst College, and Andover Theological Seminary.

Nearly three hundred ministers were preaching on peace—once a year!—and new ones were steadily pledging themselves to do so. What even this meant to some of them is indicated by a letter sent to Ladd from Vermont:

> The request to preach in December on this subject, was complied with, of course, readily. "But truly," said one of my deacons, an intelligent man, "you disappointed many of our good people last Sabbath." "Why?" "They expected that you would say *something,* at least, in favor of war!" [10]

It was bad enough to find it impossible to justify a printing of more than fifteen hundred copies of *The Harbinger of Peace,* later *The Calumet.* But even the subscribers did not pay for it, so many, said the man of Minot, "that our proceedings have been embarrassed." Hardly a month passed without the question of suspension being frankly faced, but always Ladd sighed, protested the unwisdom of such a policy in theory, and then put his hand still deeper into his jeans. "The work shall go on," he insisted, "whether our personal sacrifices be increased or diminished." The "last number" of *The Calumet* was published at least four times; but Grimké and others came to the rescue, Grimké once by dying—for after a genuinely final suspension had been decided, it was found necessary to get out an issue in his memory!

The handful were justified in complaining that the largest contributor, next to Ladd, was J. N. Mooyaart, a magistrate in far Ceylon. Any official of the modern peace movement will chuckle at the recognition of a familiar enemy that was faced just the same in 1836, when the Reverend William Ely, agent of the American Peace Society for Tolland County, Connecticut, reported:

> The great number of objects demanding contributions, now before the public, will prove a great hindrance to the success of a peace agent.

'Twas ever thus! But Ladd's troubles were not all financial. An epidemic of cholera set back the work; his own illness, finally enfeebling him, in 1833, by a paralytic stroke the effects of which lasted acutely for many months, necessitated relinquishment of his editorial labors. Richard M. Chipman, who had won a peace prize at Dartmouth, and was studying in New York for the ministry, was selected as editor, but was adjudged too indiscreet; Professor George Bush, of the "New York City University," was editor for a time but made the journal even duller than usual. Finally Ladd was able to take up the work again, but so long an interregnum out of the thirteen years allotted him by fate constituted no slight setback. And always his health seemed below par. The paralysis plagued him again and again. His death, in 1841, occurred a few hours after his return from an arduous speaking trip, on which his iron will had refused to let him quit, moving him to deliver some of his talks in a kneeling position on the platform, leaning across a chair for support. Never, after 1833, could he be called a heartily well man.

Well or sick, he never forgot to keep up a neighborly interest in his home community and its people. He used his superior financial position to aid those in distress, and was able to help the poor without injuring the relations of friendship; there was nothing patronizing in his nature. Perhaps the strongest tribute paid to him after his death came from Reuben Merrow, who worked for Ladd as a farm hand for eleven years:

I loved him. I had reason to. He was good to me. I knew him by day and by night. I know much about men. Mr. Ladd came the nearest to being a perfect man of any man I ever knew.

Childless, Mr. and Mrs. Ladd spent upon the whole town the affection they might have shared with children of their own. On the town—and on each other. Their marriage had been a *bona fide* romance, and it never ceased to be one. Their youthful love to each other, carried through many years, was a source of general comment among their intimates. But the issues of the cause were insistent and could not be denied.

Along with other problems Ladd had gone through some travail of conscience. For a quartet of years his war position remained the same. But by 1832 it had been shaken. Now there was another Ladd, in a way, for he became a complete pacifist and paved the way for a swing to that view which carried one leader after another and finally the Peace Society itself. Partly the explanation of the change lies in the increased study of war their work had forced upon them; partly responsible, of course, were the inadequate answers they had been able to find to their own hearts' questionings. But for the direct incitement to a shift like that, one must journey to Charleston, South Carolina, where lived a pious brother of two crusading sisters, a crusader too, who was not the least courageous member of a courageous family.

Judge Grimké

Sarah Grimké lived until 1873; Angelina Grimké Weld until 1879. But Thomas Smith Grimké died in 1834 at the age of forty-eight. That is why the sisters are famous and the brother far less well known. All the stirring days of the anti-slavery conflict were unexperienced by Grimké; it would have been interesting to see whether this sterling pacifist could have repressed his peace views as the bulk of his fellows succeeded in doing.

Grimké was far from a pacifist in his early manhood. After graduating from Yale in 1807 his rise as a lawyer was rapid and consistent. From 1826 to 1830 he was a state senator

in South Carolina; he became a respected judge; he was a member of the Cincinnati, that closed corporation of military aristocracy based on descent from officers in the Revolution.

In 1809 he delivered a Fourth of July oration at Charleston which was printed jointly by the Society of the Cincinnati and the American Revolution Society. It was an eloquent plea for national unity, showing something even then of an ideal which fruited later into his lonely vote against "nullification," the breaking of South Carolina's tie to the Union. It was also a glorification of the Revolutionary War. He said, in an apostrophe to his military ancestors:

> . . . often in the calm shades of domestic life, shall we regret that we did not share in your dangers, because you "fought to protect, and conquered but to bless."

And this is the respected patriot who later on in life wrote to his state legislature notifying it that he should never aid war or the military system again, who was chiefly the cause of William Ladd's change to pacifism, and who of all Americans dared to utter the strongest declaration against the necessity of the Revolutionary War ever made, not even excepting the later one by Garrison!

Ladd and Grimké rose to their radical positions with the aid of each other, much as two gamesters keep raising their bids. In the first place, Ladd was impressed with Grimké's forceful piety—his plea that "the Bible should be the Text book of duty and usefulness in every scheme of Education, from the primary school to the University." The Southerner in 1830 made the Phi Beta Kappa address at Yale, along these very lines. Ladd, who counted Grimké "the most firm and substantial pillar in our temple of Peace," was stirred as early as 1827 by the latter's daring in challenging classical education despite his own status as a classical scholar. As the Minot pietist put it, "He fearlessly exposed the demoralizing effects of classical literature on the youthful mind, and counted all such high attainments 'but as filthy rags' when there was danger that they would injure the cause of virtue and piety."

Yet it was correspondence with Ladd which first wakened Grimké to a consideration of war from a new angle. While pondering this new and disturbing idea, Grimké was given by Dr. Hubbard of the Windham County Peace Society the best book available—possibly even now of its kind—on successful non-violent resistance. It was a study of Quakerism in the midst of the Irish Rebellion, written in 1825 by Thomas Hancock, M.D., of the English peace movement.[11] From that time on, Grimké was a peace enthusiast. He republished Hancock's detailed work, which he called "this precious seed," in a large edition, and contributed heavily to Ladd's endeavors. "If we were before him in the race," wrote Ladd, "and had got midway ere he entered it he soon outstripped us."

Prior to the circulation of Hancock's book, about the best example of a non-military oasis citable were the islands of Loo Choo, which furnished the theme of Stephen Thurston's satire, but whose inhabitants had had to be fed in 1832 by the United States Navy. Although the Reverend Cyrus Yale of New Hartford directed the gaze of the local peace society to this spot "which has remained for centuries without weapons of war and without hostile invasion," the public failed to be heartily impressed. Hancock's survey was an admirably documented report of dramatic and irrefragible accomplishments by non-violent methods.

Grimké, asked to speak in May of 1832 before the Connecticut Peace Society at New Haven—with the state legislature and general public invited—went to work with the zest of any other discoverer. His address was nothing less than a knockout, as it would be called in our pacific vernacular; for sheer audacity coupled with cogent pacifist apologetics, its equal is almost non-existent. Dehydrate it by removing the sanctimonious verbiage and the rhetorical flourishes *au fait* of the period, and the effort is extraordinarily powerful.

Recognizing, as only an ex-idolater could, the appeal of the Revolution as a perpetual argument against non-violent methods, Grimké stoutly asserted that

America, as the land of christian freemen, calmly, resolutely, self-devoted to martyrdom, returning good for evil, and blessing for cursing, unprovoked by indignities and unpolluted by hatred, anger or violence, must have conquered that monarch, with his ministry, his parliament and his people.

Our new radical was of course more than a bit Quixotic; for he showed no appreciation of the high degree of social control necessary to any such disciplined solidarity. Nevertheless, he was not vague and did not await requests for a bill of particulars. Said he:

I would have had them say to the British king and his ministry, to the parliament and people of England, "We are your children and your brethren: protection and justice, encouragement and assistance from you, are our birthright. We have a British title to be free, prosperous and happy. Yet have you dealt with us, as strangers and hirelings, and even as enemies. We have petitioned and expostulated and reasoned in vain. We have besought you, by the ties of a common ancestry, by the exalted privileges of a free constitution, and the holy fellowship of christians, to spare us the bitter cup of a brother's contumely, of a parent's anger. To mockery you have added revilings, to revilings injustice, to injustice threats, to threats violence and punishment. We have borne it all, as becomes those on whose soul is the vow to love our enemies; to bless them that curse, to do good to them that hate us. We have borne it, as becomes those whose trust is in God, not as the god of battles, but as the God of mercy and righteousness, of peace and love. Go on then in your career of injustice and contempt and injury. Double the measure of our humiliation and sufferings. Brand our entreaties with the name of cowardice; call our humility meanness; our respect for you, the language of servility; and trample on our love, as the folly of the dotard or the ravings of the enthusiast. Send among us the insolent tax gatherer and the more insolent soldier. Command the delegates of your power in the chair of state or in the courts of justice, in the army or the navy, to harass and persecute and oppress. Cast the father into prison, confiscate his property, banish the wife of his bosom, scatter the children of his affections. Let the perjury of magistrates, and the corruption or timidity of jurors, condemn the innocent to death, and stain the scaffold or the faggot, with the blood of christian martyrs, in the cause of christian freedom. All this, and more than this, we are ready to bear, with a love that cannot be quenched, with a constancy inflexible and undying, with a faith

calm and humble, yet fixed and invincible. Yours is indeed the power to afflict and torment, be it our lot to suffer with fortitude and resignation; for ours is a nobler, better power, to bless and forgive. In vain may you hope to prevail. Yours are the instruments of weakness and fear, of tyranny and violence. We shall prevail; for ours are the weapons of righteousness, peace and love, the gift of God himself. As there is truth in his promises, you must yield, we shall conquer. Passion and prejudice, pride and disappointment may sustain you for a while; but our love and hope, and faith, are imperishable, inconquerable. Our purpose is irrevocably taken; we will be free: we will have the precious rights of British freemen; but, never shall violence and blood-shed be our arms. We must conquer, if we faint not. We know that passion and prejudice, anger and pride must yield, to firmness, reason, good sense, and candor. We know, that you yourselves, when the season of wrath and arrogance shall have passed away, will wipe the tears from our eyes, and wash out the blood-spots from our garments. We know, that, you yourselves will break the chains of the captive father, and recall the exiled mother, and gather their wandering children into your own bosoms. We know that the very tongue which has mocked our sufferings and uttered the sentence of imprisonment or death, will ask forgiveness in the accents of returning love. We know that the very hands, which stained the scaffold or kindled the fire, will build the monument of your own victims, and accord to the land they loved and died for, the precious privileges purchased by the love of Christian patriots, by the death of Christian martyrs.[12]

If the effect was to induce the public as a whole to think of Grimké as more to be pitied than scorned, certainly in some quarters his words ran like a train of gunpowder to a magazine. The explosion required five years to be set off; the whole policy of the American Peace Society was shifted to that of opposition to *all* war in 1837.

At once, however, Ladd was personally budged, and a host of others moved leftward with him. A renewed courage and momentum were given to the radical peace wing, and Ladd himself was stirred to remark that "one is astonished at his former opinions."

With all of Grimké's devout earnestness, his sister Sarah wrote to William Ladd that "he was the *happiest* person I ever saw. He seemed to *enjoy* life with a zest and unvary'd

cheerfulness which was very remarkable." He is described as always a delightful companion.

History contains not a few records of personalities coupled in spirit and greatly moving each other, although never seen face to face. It was so with these two; but the peace movement reveals no case of similar attachment across cold space. "We never enjoyed the happiness of seeing him," said Ladd, "though for many years closely allied to him, as to a kindred spirit of much higher attainments."

But almost a century before Andrew Carnegie's advocacy of reformed orthography, Grimké was venturing to use such spelling as "nativ," "lovd," "honord," "developd," and "afection." And when it came to this particular innovation, William Ladd did as others of the bravest have always done. He paled before it, and confessed, "We have not yet examined this new mode of spelling, but whatever may be hereafter our convictions as to its utility, we fear we shall not have sufficient moral courage to follow the example."

Pacifism Triumphant

Even before Grimké's impetus, a few voices were raised on behalf of pacifism in the American Peace Society. A tract was put out by one "Pacificus" in New York in 1830 under the imprint of the Society's Executive Committee, entitled *Appeal to American Christians on the Practice of War.* This pamphlet lost no time on side issues:

> Stand forth, then, an advocate for the principles of the early Christians, for the true spirit and teaching of Christianity, and the only doctrine which will ever despoil the monster war of his dominion over Christendom and the world. The toleration of defensive warfare would perpetuate his reign till the final conflagration. There can be, I am persuaded, no end to this plague of man and beast, except through a practical union of good and philanthropic men in the pacific principle, that wars, aggressive and defensive, are totally inconsistent with the spirit and principles of the Christian religion.

The Reverend R. V. Rogers, of St. Philips Church in Circleville, Ohio, wrote strongly against "defensive" war in 1833.

Thomas Cock, M.D., of New York, in 1835, called for "total abstinence" from war. The Reverend Dr. Nathan Strong surreptitiously confided to some influential friends in his Hartford study that privately he had become convinced of the wrongfulness of even the wars men called defensive. Reverend Jonathan Coggswell, at Hartford in the same year, addressed the Hartford County Peace Society and in the names of Jerome and Chrysostom called for a return to the peace stand of the church fathers. Meantime, Ladd's own change of view wielded a potent influence.

When William Ladd stirred up Professor Thomas C. Upham of Bowdoin, he let loose upon the peace problem an able thinker, a vigorous writer, an energetic and fearless prophet. Still in his early thirties, he was acknowledged as a brilliant student of philosophy and religion. He, too, was subject to the inadequate critical knowledge of his time, yet his vocabulary seems less colored with theological phantasms than that of some pacifists who were contemporaneous.

His *Manual of Peace,* published in 1836, covered the whole war against war as thus far conceived. He argued for world organization, urged removal of war's causes, but most of all he called for a more strenuous anti-war campaign by the peace societies themselves. More detailed than that of any other was his argument, more difficult to surmount. His book was sold out in a few months but its effect lingered. Looking back from the vantage point of almost a century's perspective, his insight seems astonishingly accurate:

> Every one must admit that, in effecting a great moral object, everything depends upon the adoption of a correct moral principle. If the societies should be so unfortunate as to start upon an unsound principle as their basis, they may certainly count upon finding themselves practical nullities. We submit, then (in concurrence with the opinions of others whose views are entitled to much consideration), that it is necessary to adopt, as a fundamental article of these societies, the principle, that all wars whatever, both offensive and *defensive* are repugnant to the precepts and spirit of the gospel, and are sinful. . . .
>
> It will be found on experience, if it has not already been, that

Peace societies, which admit the lawfulness of Defensive war, do not essentially disturb the quiet of warriors and politicians, with whatever prudence and zeal they may be conducted. These persons will even become polite and laudatory, and pronounce such societies very good.

This, as it happens, precisely describes the American Peace Society in its later days, the Lake Mohonk Conferences, the heavily endowed peace organizations, in fact, most peace groups—as the chapters yet to come will certainly disclose.

However, Upham's plea, for a time, was not devoid of results. Faced by this growing rebellion at the Society's equivocal position, and spurred also by the refusal of some groups to join the larger body, the A. P. S. officials began to consider a formal change.

In anticipation of it, the President of Bowdoin made strenuous objections. There were two William Allens to be counted in the peace movement—the thoroughgoing English Quaker, and this stern New England educator. President Allen wrote a number of articles for the magazines, upholding defensive war. One of these, during Ladd's disability, was run in *The Calumet* without comment. In the next issue Ladd, greatly concerned, made an elaborate explanation, and also defended the complete anti-war view:

> Although I am myself opposed to all war in every form, as utterly inconsistent with the spirit of the Gospel, I am willing, that the sincere friends of Peace, who do not yet see their way clear to take that high ground, should have liberty to state their objections to it in candor—for how else can those objections be met? Truth should never fear a candid discussion, especially when it comes in the spirit of Peace. Nevertheless, I think that articles in favor of war in any shape, should not have been published, without, at least, a temporary answer, or something to show, that, although the Society might think itself in honor and in duty bound to publish them, it did not adopt the principles contained in them, as its own creed; but reserved to itself the right of withholding its judgment at least for the present.[13]

One can sympathize with President Allen without agreeing with him; for his arguments were able ones, and he probed unanswerably into the literal fundamentalism on which Ladd, at

least, rested so much of his case. When he lost out, however, he withdrew none too gracefully from the Society altogether.

All the opposition was not intellectual. Economic considerations constituted a brake on pacifism. Protests came in from the field. One rather naïve and revelatory complaint came in from the Reverend Mr. Ely in the northern part of the Nutmeg State:

> In my opinion, serious injury has been done to the society by placing defensive and offensive wars upon the same ground. The opinion among the people of all classes, is nearly universal, that wars *strictly defensive may sometimes* be demanded. *So far as I know, no* objection is made to the course which the American Peace Society pursues.[14]

Having thus uttered a warning against the pacifist agitators, Mr. Ely went on to state that in asking for contributions he had found it advisable to solicit no donations that would interfere with other benevolences or "which would subject the donor to inconvenience." There's a sacrificial spirit for you! Also:

> I found it important to state, that no opposition was designed against the regularly instituted authorities of government. In repeated instances I solicited and received donations from members and officers of military companies at the same time publishing to them the principles of peace.

No warning like this could deter men who were clearly able to see how weak-kneed a movement would inevitably follow the employment of such tactics to build it up. The official change was made, and with William Ladd's approval.

Originally the Society's object had been

> . . . to diffuse light respecting the evils of war and the best means of effecting its abolition.

In 1837 a new constitution was adopted. It democratized the Society by transferring final power from a hand-picked board of directors to a voting rank and file with elective officers. The object clause was stiffened to read:

> This society, being founded on the principle that all war is contrary to the spirit of the gospel, shall have for its object to illustrate the inconsistency of war with Christianity, to show its baleful

influence on all the great interests of mankind, and to devise means for insuring universal and permanent peace.

Since William Ladd's will making the Society a legatee had directed that the object of the Society should never be changed and since he was still functioning, those who felt this object insufficiently explicit had a high barrier to leap. They made it, however, by working out a scheme of explanatory resolutions. Several of these were passed: one, designed to show that war was meant, and that individual use or non-use of force was not involved; another, to make it clear that no member was obliged to take a formal pledge. The most significant of these interpretations stated, of the object clause:

> We consider it as designed to assert, that all national wars are inconsistent with Christianity, including those supposed or alleged to be defensive.

Just prior to his death three years before, Grimké had ventured a prophecy:

> The principle for which I contend, has not as yet been adopted by the American Peace Society, but I do not entertain a doubt that many years will not elapse, before it will become an article of the constitution.[15]

Right he was! The pacifist principle of opposition to all war and the whole war system was now the normal, official organization view. What this meant to the peace movement, if not shown by the chapters thus far covered, assuredly will be by the story of the later years. The various emphases that had been tried by the peace societies were interestingly summed up by Ladd in *The Calumet* for May-June, 1834. This summary will be found as Appendix IV. It reveals that the ideology and tactics of 1834 are separated by an astonishingly slender margin from the ideology and tactics of to-day. Even this new basic objective, focused as it was so exclusively on an undependable church factor and associated with evanescent theological irrelevancies, was to be scarcely more effective a control than the others.

The pacifists were gravely glad, and settled down to build

more vigorously than ever, let the outward opposition be however strong. But it was not the attack from without they needed to reckon with. From the disgruntled and the shocked and the "compromised" conservatives came a counter-revolution. From a stormy area of political, economic and social movements far beyond their control also emerged a dozen compelling cross-currents that were destined to swamp the frail bark before its sails were fully spread.

Pacifism had triumphed; but it was to be a Pyrrhic victory.

CHAPTER XVII

CRISES

As there is no square inch in space to which the law of gravity is not as necessary as to any other square inch, so there is no portion of the moral universe to which the royal law of love *is not as necessary as to any other portion of it.*—ELIHU BURRITT, in *The Bond of Brotherhood,* November, 1846.

Light does not travel in a straight line in those parts of the universe where there is gravitation, but its path is curved like that of heavy objects.—ALBERT EINSTEIN, *Theory of General Relativity.*

CHAPTER XVII

CRISES

WHAT is it that determines how men may think at any given time, or what ideas may compel attention? If the events of a period could be traced exclusively to one responsible incident, personality or group, how simple would be the writing of historic narrative!

Few new movements ever have a moment's peace and the peace movement was no exception. The fight for peace could not be run by Queensbury rules in a roped-off arena. Peace is not a static, objective thing, and the fruits of victory cannot be plucked like apples and put away in a basket. A dynamic conception of a new society can hardly be immune to the social ideas which vitally concern it.

There may have been another period in our history as full of ferment as the second quarter of the nineteenth century, but it may be doubted. In every direction the leaven of humanitarianism was expanding. The labor movement was getting up steam; the demands of women for equality were becoming vocal; religious liberalism, always a storm center, was flowering into an irresistible respectability through the literary output of the group of writers around Boston—Emerson, Thoreau, Holmes, Lowell and Longfellow; abolitionism was beginning to seethe; the whole question of how to treat the criminal was being ethically examined; and in the experimental communities and elsewhere the idea of government was being frankly queried and handled with an unworshipful skepticism.

Pulled this way and that by conflicts of interest and clashes of ideals, the peace movement was going through the inevitable change of leadership. From the moment of Ladd's death in

1841, there ceased to be one leader, but instead there were several; and among them were militant pacifists, stout conservatives, and the "middle-of-the-roaders" who performed their normal function of preventing, for a time, any movement down the road or up.

The Non-Resistant Society

William Ladd lived long enough to feel the ground swell of impending storms. In fact he went through one.

To William Lloyd Garrison must be attributed the episode, perhaps, though he was only the spokesman for a sentiment that would not be denied. Garrison had received his early ideas against war from the *Massachusetts Peace Society,* and for a time he greatly admired the American Peace Society, the national body of which it was a part. So deeply did he venerate the older man who was its leader, that, as he recalled in 1871, "Such was my appreciation of his character and labors that, more than forty years ago, I dedicated to William Ladd the following sonnet which was printed in the first volume of *The Liberator:*

> The conquerors of the earth have had their day—
> Their fame lies weltering in a bloody shroud;
> As Crime and Desolation haste away,
> So fade their glory and their triumphs proud.
> Great advocate! a fairer wreath is thine,
> Base Envy cannot soil, nor Time destroy;
> Thou art enlisted in a cause divine,
> Which yet shall fill all earth and heaven with joy.
> To calm the passions of a hostile world;
> To make content and happiness increase;
> In every clime to see that flag unfurled,
> Long since uplifted by the Prince of Peace;
> This is thy soul's desire, thy being's aim,
> No barrier can impede, no opposition tame.[1]

It was all right for Garrison to remember his verse with pride thirty years after Ladd was gone; but when he knew the "distinguished advocate of peace" a little longer than he had when he first wrote it, he complained confidentially to his friend

Henry E. Benson that Ladd was "a good-natured man, but somewhat superficial" (a judgment not entirely unfair); and in 1838 wrote to Sarah Benson, regarding the famous convention of that year, that "the deep solemnity of the occasion was somewhat disturbed by the broad and irresistible humor of William Ladd. He is a huge and strange compound of fat, good-nature, and benevolence. He went with us nineteen-twentieths of the way, and said he expected to 'go the whole' next year!" [2]

Garrison, at that time lean with youth and none too easy a life, was invariably bitter about those who seemed well fed. When he heard Joseph John Gurney lecture at the Arch Street Meeting House in Philadelphia, the Englishman's speech displeased him because it did not mention slavery, and the abolitionist wryly complained in a letter to his wife that Gurney was "a fine specimen of English corporosity, having 'a fair round belly, with good capon lined,'" and that he sat down "as if he had a score of eggs under him." Justly aroused at Gurney's continual temporizing, Garrison had to vent his spleen in terms that almost reveal a hungry secret envy!

Whatever Garrison's faults, his was an incisive mind; and whatever Ladd's merits, his was not. Garrison always knew exactly what he wanted; Ladd was never wholly certain. At this convention of 1838 the two minds came into conflict.

It began when Elijah Lovejoy was killed by a mob at Alton, Illinois, while defending by arms the fourth anti-slavery printing press he had set up there. Almost all of the abolitionists justified Lovejoy's use of weapons; but though Garrison, unlike Channing, did not withhold affectionate praise and sorrow, he declared that he could not "in conscience delay the expression of our regret that our martyred coadjutor and his unfaltering friends in Alton should have allowed any provocation, or personal danger, or hope of victory, or distrust of the protection of Heaven, to drive them to take up arms in self-defence." Forthwith *The Liberator* published a long article based on the central determination that "next to the overthrow of slavery, the cause of PEACE will command our attention."

Having broadcast his non-resistant views, Garrison besought the American Peace Society to hold a meeting in Boston. The fate of Lovejoy excited comment everywhere, and the fact that Garrison agreed with Ladd's quick condemnation of violence in that historic instance, stirred warm discussion in many circles.

A resolution calling for the assembly of a new convention to discuss peace work and tactics was adopted at the American Peace Society's annual meeting in May of 1838, and Ladd, as President, appointed an official committee to do the tasks incidental to preparing the forthcoming conference.

Though he was in reality fearful of what might take place at such a meeting, Ladd sent the call to members of the American Peace Society. Promptly the preparations for the affair settled down to a type of strategic maneuvering which exhibits both radical and conservative as something less than saints.

Ladd was a mixer, and he was so placative that he ran risks of getting himself in trouble by seeking to satisfy conflicting groups—a policy which ceased to be effective when the two groups came together. He did his best on this occasion to keep a goodly company of conservative stalwarts on hand to vote out of consideration any matters other than peace and war in the narrow sense.

As for Garrison, he openly scored the American Peace Society (basing his feeling upon an out-of-date unawareness of the change in Ladd and in the Society's constitution) for "enrolling upon its list of members not converted but belligerous commanders-in-chief, generals, colonels, majors, corporals and all," and avowed that "unless they alter their present course, the first thing I shall do will be to serve our Peace Societies as I have done the Colonization Societies."

Samuel J. May was a member of the committee charged with running the conference. He was not then fully in accord and admitted to Garrison that "you and brother Wright [Henry C.] have startled me, but I am determined to follow wherever *truth* may guide." But he was not content to follow; rather he wanted to guide the destiny of the conference. To Garrison he wrote:

If we do not drive off the timid ones by broaching our ultra doctrines in the beginning, but lead them along through the preliminaries,—getting them to concede certain fundamental truths,—we may at last surprise many into the acknowledgment of a faith from which at first they would revolt.

Systematic campaigners, these fellows! Garrison was asked to bring a report on the inquiry "whether the principles of Christianity require us even to forgive public criminals, and not put them to death or keep them in prison." And more heresies were carefully nurtured:

Brother Wright will prepare one on the inviolability of human life; Quincy [Edmund], on the right of others, as well as members of the Society of Friends, to have their conscientious scruples respecting military trainings, etc., duly regarded. Walker [Amasa] will prepare one on military parades and titles. Others have been or will be requested to write on other topics. All this should be *inter nos.*

That is to say, "Between ourselves." But such things leak out. On the evening before the convention a party of moderates gathered at the Eagle Bank to discuss the technique of opposing an immovable object to an irresistible impulse. Ladd discreetly stayed away; but George C. Beckwith, always a sort of yes-man to the past, mobilized an opposition to Henry Wright's well-known anti-ballot and anti-violence views, to all kinds of "extravagance of ultra men," and especially to the admittance of women—an issue over which as we have seen, these men left the meeting on the morrow.

The convention was the greatest imaginable combination of nobility, pettiness, high principle, low manipulation, comedy and tragedy. It seems incredible that two such contradictory versions of it could have been given as the reports of Garrison and Ladd.

The letter of Garrison to his wife, describing the revolt over the presence of women, has been quoted in a previous chapter. More excerpts from it are illuminating:

In the afternoon, bro. Wright opened the discussion, by offering a resolution declaring that no man, no government, has a right

to take the life of man, on any pretext, according to the gospel of Christ. He made a very able argument, and was replied to by a Reverend Mr. Powers, of Scituate, but in a feeble manner. In the evening, Dr. Follen made a long and ingenious speech against the resolution, and contended that a man had a right to defend himself by violence. Bro. Wright spoke in reply, and was catechised, while upon the stand, pretty freely. He answered all objections very readily. Several others addressed the meeting, very briefly, which was then adjourned.

The discussion was continued with great animation the next forenoon. Reverend Mr. Gannett [Ezra Stiles] made a speech against the resolution, and moved its indefinite postponement. I replied to him in a manner that grieved him sorely. The resolution was adopted by a large majority. In the afternoon a committee of nine was appointed to draw up a Constitution and a Declaration of Sentiments, of which I was chairman. I first wrote the Constitution, radical in all things, and presented it without delay. It created much discussion, which lasted during the evening, but was adopted by a decisive majority [28 to 15].

Yesterday forenoon was occupied in the consideration and adoption of sundry important resolutions [one of which was against completion of the Bunker Hill Monument]; but I absented myself to write the Declaration. In the afternoon, it was reported to the Convention, and never was a more "fanatical" or "disorganizing" instrument penned by man. It swept the whole surface of society, and upturned almost every existing institution on earth. Of course it produced a deep and lively sensation, and a very long and critical debate; and, to my astonishment, was adopted by those present by a vote of more than five to one. [The vote was 26 to 5; but over a dozen conservatives had departed just before it.] It was ordered to be engrossed upon parchment, and the signatures of those who approved it are to be appended to it. It will make a tremendous stir, not only in this country, but, in time, throughout the world. . . . By this procedure your husband will have subjected himself afresh to the scorn, hatred, and persecution of an ungodly world; but my trust is in the God of Jacob. I know that the sentiments of the Declaration are of God, and must prevail.[3]

Casting about for a name that would be more in accord with the new society's principles than so vague a word as "peace," Garrison decided on "non-resistance"—a word which has done more to confuse thought than he could have believed, and

which I shall deal with below. The New England Non-Resistance Society was a fact. At last there was a peace organization that was almost super-pacifist, you might say, and without any bars of sex or color.

The Declaration of Sentiments was destined to move Leo Tolstoy, years later, so much so that he incorporated it into his book, *The Kingdom of God Is within You.* It did indeed arouse intense opposition, but also intense loyalty and intense interest. Beginning in January, 1839, and continuing until June, 1842, its essential principles were sent out regularly, and applied to current events, in *The Non-Resistant,* first as a monthly then as a semi-monthly, at one dollar a year; its editors were Edmund Quincy, Maria W. Chapman, and Garrison himself.

The text of that astonishing Declaration will be found as Appendix V. It refused allegiance to any human government, it voiced an unqualified internationalism, it opposed punishment by force, it declared against all forms of war, it committed its signers against holding office or voting for others to do so, and it called for a type of devoted living the beauty of which was not without vigorous assertion of ideals. On the face of it erratic, contradictory, ill-considered; yet a study of it will induce only respect, if not agreement, by anyone. It is a great historic paper.

Even so, its public influence was doubtless much exaggerated. It did indeed stir up the American Peace Society; a flood of conservative protest dashed against Ladd's portly figure and caught him still braced against the radicals. No wonder he was pushed off balance. His alibi throws more light on the peace tactics of both sides to the controversy than any other source. Beckwith wrote in *The Advocate of Peace* for December, 1840:

> We have from the first aimed to avoid all collision with the Non-Resistants; but we have deemed it our duty to furnish the community with the means of distinguishing our enterprise from theirs, and have supposed that men, intelligent on such subjects, understood well the distinction. A few well-known facts will suffice to show that we cannot in any sense be held responsible for

their principles or their measures.—1. We had no agency in bringing that society into existence, but refused to call the Convention, though termed a *Peace Convention,* which organized it. [It will have been noted that this was hardly the truth.] —2. When confounded with it, we distinctly and repeatedly disclaimed all responsibility for its movements, and pointed out the difference between us.—3. We know not that any member of our Society has joined that [several prominent ones had]; and the strongest peace-men in this country and in England, have stood aloof from that movement.—4. The Quakers themselves, certainly thorough enough on peace, have, as a body, published their disclaimer of all responsibility for the peculiar views which characterize the Non-Resistants.

Still not a few have been in doubt whether our President was not at heart in sympathy with Non-Resistants; but his account of their recent annual meeting or Convention in Boston, published in the Christian Mirror, must, we think, put an end to their doubts on this point. Those who know Mr. Ladd, cannot need the extracts we subjoin; but we give them for the satisfaction of our readers in general, premising that, being in this city at the time he "attended, in order to observe their movements, and to defend the American Peace Society against any attack that might be made upon it."

Ladd's own comments follow:

The discussion took a wide range, so far from the resolution, that if the former had had the plague, the latter would never have caught the infection. Arminianism, Transcendentalism, and all kinds of radicalism were drawn into the debate, which concerned the meaning of the words "human nature," and the whole afternoon was consumed, in what appeared to me to be, beating the air. The question was at length put to rest by inserting the word "better" before the word "promptings," which was unanimously passed, and the Convention adjourned to 7 P.M. . . .

The resolve discussed in the evening was, "That all existing human governments are based on the life-taking, war-making principle as essential to their existence, and they are therefore wrong; and no person believing in the inviolability of human life, and the sinfulness of war, can be identified with them as electors or office-holders without guilt." Under this resolution I took the opportunity to point out some of the essential differences between the American Peace Society, and the New England Non-Resistant Society, in which I vindicated the right and duty of every citizen to vote for rulers, where he had a choice of one candidate over the others, and illustrated my argument by the

case of the slave who had a cruel master, who beat, starved, and over-worked him; and contended that the slave had a right to seek a better master though a slave holder; and that he did not thereby acknowledge the right of slavery. . . . My opponents were driven to the absurdity of denying that the slave had any right to choose between a good master and a bad one, and that he sinned in so doing!

In the evening, under the resolution concerning taxes and fines, I was called to answer Mr. Garrison, who has ridiculed the American Peace Society, as "Utopian(!), based on nothing, supported by one man, who was the Peace Society personified, and that when *he* died the American Peace Society would die with him; that it had no vitality, no principle, and that the plan of a congress of nations was chimerical." In answer, I attempted to show that the Massachusetts Peace Society, which he likewise censured, had done much good, that it first brought the subject of peace before the American public, and had wrought a great change in public opinion; that if it were inert or defunct, it was because it had done up its work, and brought the public up to its standard; that it was the mother of the American Peace Society, and that even Mr. Garrison himself and many of the leaders of the Non-Resistant Society had drawn their first ideas on peace from the Massachusetts Peace Society; and that Mr. Garrison had published, in a paper which he edited in Vermont, the essays of Philanthropos, when that writer was a member of the Massachusetts Peace Society and saw no further than the Society did; and that he and his compeers of both sexes had climbed up to the dizzy height on which they stood, step by step, and now they would kick away the ladder on which they had ascended, and call on all passers-by, to jump up there to the top of the ladder, at a single leap. . . . I showed that the object of the American Peace Society is one, and only one, the prevention of international war; and that, therefore, it has nothing to do with capital punishments, duelling, internal commotions, or the organization of governments, any more than it has with intemperance and slavery; and that we exact no pledge or creed on any of these subjects; that our plan of a congress of nations is more feasible than their objects whether good or bad; and that though the originators of it may not live to see its completion, it is the opinion of wise and good men, that the time is not far distant when it will go into operation. The Non-Resistants cannot but see the discrepancy between our principles and theirs, and that a congress of nations must depend on submission to "the powers that be"; and that, therefore, no member of their society can consistently favor our plan, or wish us godspeed, and that though on one point, viz.,

the denunciation of all war we agree; and on all others we are either neutral or at variance.

Of the next resolution I have no copy, but it was to this effect, "that all ministers and churches which support existing governments attempt to dethrone Christ!" One speaker denounced all governments, ministers, Sabbaths, and ordinances, and pretended to be as much inspired as any man ever was.

On the whole, if I were asked if the Non-Resistant Society were more likely to do good than hurt, I should answer, not much of either. I have no doubt of their sincerity and integrity. They *mean* to do good, and make great sacrifices to do it. There are some minds so constitutionally ultra, that they will never undertake anything without going beyond the truth. But, after all, there is no ultraism so bad as the ultra-conservative, which will never undertake any thing for fear of going too far. I do not think that the Society will ever produce any great effect. When they began, they thought they were as ultra as possible; but the convention to be called will go beyond them, and they will start off together in a tangent from this sublunary sphere, and will either explode or be lost in the limbo of vanity, among gone-by chimeras and abortions, and the odd ends and bits of creation.

So much of Ladd's heat was fully warranted. And so much of Garrison's! But when was there a better illustration of right and wrong on both sides of a quarrel?

That Ladd was no coward Garrison should have realized, for at the convention he served at the head of a committee which brought in a most drastic report "on military establishments in time of peace." One sentence of this document recommended "to all the friends of peace, firmly, though meekly, to refuse to comply with the requisitions of the military laws." And this from the man who could not join with the "anti-governments" in their non-voting policy and thus earned their scorn!

It must not be forgotten that one of these men was twenty-seven years older than the other. The younger one was correct in his prophecy concerning the future conservatism of the American Peace Society; but so was the older man regarding the remoteness from reality in so much of the program of the Non-Resistants.

Ladd failed, however, as one must have in his position of financial security and conservatism on abolition, to appreciate

fully the courage required for the leading anti-slavery crusaders to announce themselves as non-resistants. By no means were the abolitionists willing to accept pacific doctrines (as became clear in 1861!), and such a prominent leader as James G. Birney declared that those who thought they ought to love their enemies ought to get out of the movement. An organized revolt was launched against Garrison, whose leaders thought that with the radical out of their way they could attract as officers—in the language of the Reverend George Trask—"the Honorables, the D.D.'s, the Rabbis of the land." [4] This movement did not long survive; but for that matter neither, actively, did the Non-Resistant Society.

Peace, Garrison had said, came *next* to abolition. And the horrors of slavery, even discounting the exaggerations, were indeed enough to melt a heart of stone—which his decidedly was not. Soon the one great struggle of his life was to engross him almost utterly. And meantime, the peace movement was in for a long and strident series of perennial debates over issues that simply would not down.

Like all struggles, however, the contest of ideas must be worked out through human beings. The friendly associates, David Dodge and Noah Worcester, had held up conflicting ideals for the movement; Garrison and Ladd had stood for rival forces. Now, under the leadership of George C. Beckwith and Elihu Burritt two camps were to plead for public opinion. Two men, both developed, sacrificial. Two men, one picturesque, romantic; one colorless and drab. Two men, one reaching far more stature than the other—these two were now to dramatize two different kinds of tactics. One was uncompromising; one adaptive. One put in thirty-seven years for peace; one, thirty-four. One would have made the peace movement a great force and even as it was, accomplished marvels; one kept it safe and sane—and ineffective.

The Learned Blacksmith

Elihu Burritt is indeed a legendary figure. No such person could have lived; and yet he did. Consider this man.

He was the son of a humble shoemaker; he fraternized with the greatest personages of Europe, who admired him greatly.

He was so shy as a boy that he ran down cellar and hid behind a barrel to avoid the guests at his sister's wedding; he addressed audiences of the most critical character and won the esteem of the most learned with his ease and eloquence.

He was always plagued by illness and in no sense robust; but he walked many miles in America, Ireland, England, and on the Continent, and thought nothing of working ten, twelve, fourteen hours a day at his blacksmith's anvil.

He was a first-rate blacksmith; he did most of his work with a book in some alien tongue propped up before him.

He was a self-educated man; before he was thirty he could translate fifty languages; before he died he knew nearly a hundred, and several times he translated documents in odd tongues which had been given up by college faculties.

He wrote glowingly about every new invention that was coming into use; he wrote *Sanskrit for the Fireside.*

He was as little vain as any man; he wore a wig.

He was intensely devoted to the progress of women, believed in their destiny and power, and wrote for *The Ladies Wreath and Literary Gatherer;* he never married.

He had never heard a spokesman of peace or read a word of peace literature; he surprised veteran peace workers by an anti-war address in Boston which carried them off their feet.

He did not believe violence and war would give the slaves the most genuine freedom; he had a substitute for disunion or war in "compensated emancipation."

He refused to endorse the Civil War and was sometimes called "pro-South"; he was appointed U. S. Consul to Birmingham, England, in 1865.

He is one of our country's greatest figures; he is unknown to the general public.

Elihu Burritt was born at New Britain, Connecticut, on the eighth of December, 1810. He was the last of ten children. His father died when he was eighteen, and young Elihu began to learn the blacksmith's trade. He looked up to his older

brother Elijah with profound respect, for Elijah was an educator widely respected and the author of a standard textbook on astronomy. Determined to get a bit more education, despite his circumstances, Elihu left his smithing for three months and folded his long, lean legs under a desk in his brother's school. Intricate problems in mental arithmetic were his specialty, and here he amazed his erudite instructor. But he had picked up enough of French and Latin to feel the fascination of a foreign language. The complexities of translation appealed to his far-flung imagination, but even more perhaps were they a challenge to his conqueror's soul. By day at the forge and by night in his room he mastered his declensions.

Horatio Alger had not yet come on the American scene; so instead of flitting to Wall Street and financial eminence, Burritt went to New Haven after learning. He kept away from Yale and found it; but not so much from prejudice against the institution as his pecuniary situation and his fear of matriculation at the ripe old age of twenty-two. He thought, however, that culture would be in the air, and anticipated the acquisition of an education very much along the same lines as the germ theory of disease.

Perhaps it worked; for by the middle of the first afternoon, following a hard day of solitary labor, he had deciphered fifteen lines of Homer's *Iliad*. He strutted out on the campus, very likely curling his lips in whimsical derision at the uncaring towers, and decided he needed nothing but his own persistence. He would have been even more reassured if he could have foreseen that in 1872 Yale University was going to take pride in giving him an honorary Master of Arts degree.

Persistence he had indeed. All winter long he spent poring over his Greek, Latin, Hebrew, German, Spanish, and Italian. In the spring, still elated with his new-found confidence, he went back home and took a teaching job. But Burritt had to use his muscles and breathe outdoor air, or else his health went bad; and so he became a traveling salesman. Soon he opened a grocery store in New Britain but was caught badly by the depression of 1837. Discouraged, longing to pursue his language

lore by first-hand contact, he tramped to Boston with the half-intent of getting a job aboard some ship. But he could find nothing very promising, so walked westward again to Worcester. Here he found a treasure chest in the fine old library of the Antiquarian Society. Now he was happy, for he found a job at blacksmithing and could not hope to exhaust the fascinating volumes, many of which were in foreign tongues.

How he labored! His diary reveals the pace at which he drove himself:

June 18 [*1837*]. Headache; forty pages Cuvier's Theory of the Earth; sixty-four pages French; eleven hours' forging.

June 19. Sixty lines Hebrew; thirty pages French; ten pages Cuvier's Theory; eight lines Syriac; ten lines Danish; ten ditto Bohemian; nine ditto of Polish; fifteen names of stars; ten hours forging.

June 20. Twenty-five lines Hebrew; eight of Syriac; eleven hours' forging.

June 21. Fifty-five lines Hebrew; eight of Syriac; eleven hours' forging.

June 22. Unwell; twelve hours' forging.

Confident of his ability to handle translations professionally, Burritt wrote a letter to a prominent Worcester publisher asking a chance to earn money by translating some German book. William Lincoln, who received the letter, was impressed beyond measure by the story of Burritt's struggles and attainments. He sent the communication to Governor Everett, who read it at a meeting. It was thereupon published in the press and widely copied. Burritt was a marked man. Invitations to lecture poured in upon him; phrenological journals went into ecstasies over his deep-set eyes and bulging brows; and in the public mind there was just that tinge of unbelief which is the making of many a circuit rider of the rostrum.

Fame and fortune now seemed the lot of "the learned blacksmith." A career of ease and elegance might readily have been his. But his curious mind forbade it. He lectured, true; and widely. But that painful reading of Cuvier had done a bigger job than seems conceivable. Pondering this comparative anatomy, crude and fanciful as it was, started a new idea in Bur-

ritt's brain. The earth, he saw, was like the human body. Like human veins and blood were the rivers and the seas; like bone and muscle were the mountains and the soil. Life was a oneness; the earth should be whole. Nations needed the friendly cooperation of each other so the world might function as one organism. But instead of that, always there were schisms, frictions, wars or rumors of wars. And from that night onward, Elihu Burritt's hand was against the world as it was. The craftsman who boasted, and not idly, that he could wield more mechanical tools than any other Jack-of-all-trades in Kingdom Come, was out to shape the world to his heart's desire.

And this organic oneness was the theme of an address he made in 1841 at the Tremont Temple, Boston. Present were not only members of the *cognoscenti* and the *literati,* but of the *pacifisti.* And these were overwhelmed; crowding forward, they claimed him as their own, and theirs he was in truth.

Stirred more himself than anyone, he went back home and in a short time began the publication of *The Christian Citizen,* dedicated not merely to general moral advancement but to the abolition of slavery and of war. "Peace," its masthead said; "God hath made of one blood all nations of men." Followed a quotation from the Irish agitator, Daniel O'Connell: "Remember no political change is worth a single crime, or above all, a single drop of human blood."

The Literary Gemini, an early periodical, had not done well; but the *Citizen* fared better, and *The Bond of Brotherhood,* issued later, exerted a considerable influence. Soon began those *Sparks from the Anvil,* a book which made the first of a long series of volumes. Some half-dozen magazines and thirty books came from his pen before he died in 1879.[5] Up to his declining years, when he was suffering from an inescapable doom and devoting himself to model farming, he labored steadily for peace; though from his Birmingham appointment onward, it was the more respectable projects of arbitration, disarmament, and a congress of nations which had his backing. There was a diminution, not of loyalty, but of fire and fervor.

Fire he had, however, when he threw himself into the move-

ment in 1845. Recognizing a stalwart, Beckwith enlisted his aid and he was made a member of the A.P.S. Executive Committee. His blue eyes flashed at the chance of doing something hard and risky; his voice, "of a peculiar quality, but pleasing," carried conviction and encouragement. He was urged to take from Beckwith's heavy-laden shoulders the editorship of *The Advocate of Peace*. He did so; and from all outward signs a promising period was ahead.

But these two could not work in harness. Beckwith had come into the movement in 1835, had worked with Ladd, had seized many a financial defeat and turned it into victory, and had contributed heavily himself. He was not going to be pushed by any newcomer. He left to the Society, as a matter of fact, a bequest which increased in value and by 1888 was worth some sixty-seven thousand dollars, and forms part of a fund from which the American Peace Society derives income to-day. Beckwith was nine years older. He was by temper not a little autocratic. He was not above petty jealousy and underhanded wire-pulling. He could argue on either side of an issue, not so much because he had a tolerant mind but more to forward whatever immediate end he sought.

If he had been only this, he could not have done what he did. He was a strong despiser of war, he loved his work, his distrust of radicalism was not always without justification, and he kept organized peace work alive in the United States after the death of Ladd when it surely would have flagged without him.

The Reverend George Cone Beckwith died in 1870, after thirty-three years as Secretary of the A.P.S. Those years were witnesses of compromise and courage, things to be admired and things otherwise. But nothing in them all was so indicative of the weakness in conservative tactics as his run-in with the eager Burritt.

Burritt and pacifism were to lose, officially; Beckwith and moderation were to win—and so was War.

That struggle has its modern parallels. Let us look into it. It was no dry affair.

Pacifism Rejected

Beckwith's duty, as he saw it, was to save an organization. He succeeded. To proclaim the truth was Burritt's mission, and to let nothing interfere. He, too, succeeded.

Since then, however, a prudential obscurantism has covered up the episode, which is important both to history and to our study of peace tactics.

Burritt, as a peace man, was still young. In the eyes of the wise ones who thought it necessary to speak in respectfully apologetic tones of their pacifism, he soon became a real *enfant terrible.* He did not carry a chip on his shoulder, but he wore his colors on his sleeve. If silence on all other controversial matters was to be the price of gains in the prestige of the peace societies, he was unwilling to pay it—he and a goodly minority who stood by him. In this respect he was like Garrison, and yet how unlike! For as time went on he drew only scorn from the fiery advocate of disunion; and yet he did not fall in with the idea of colonizing the American Negroes—a fantastic proposal, disregardful of birth rates, shipping facilities, or of anything practical except, perhaps, the avoidance of censure. Only some ten thousand were sent in this way to Liberia between 1822 and 1856, and most of these succumbed to fever.

William Ladd had been, at least in the beginning, a colonizationist, as were many in the peace societies. It was only time, along with a frank face-to-face criticism from Samuel J. May, that wooed Channing away from the idea. A critical article on the abolitionists by W. B. O. Peabody was run in one of the earliest issues of *The Harbinger of Peace.* Noah Worcester had stated in *The Friend of Peace* that "the Colonization Society should be viewed with great respect."

At this time the Reverend Baron Stow was a director of the American Peace Society, and the abolitionists justly liked him little. For in 1835, when there was a furore in Boston over the presence of one or two Negroes at church services, his church had inserted a clause in its pew deeds providing that

pews should be held "by none but respectable white persons." Many Quakers were active against slavery, yet others of that body barred the doors of meetinghouses against spokesmen for abolition. As so often has happened in the peace movement, the longing for peace in the hearts of many was accompanied by a strange apathy toward injustice. Friction, a continual pulling of individuals this way and that, was inevitable at such a time—just as to-day over economic issues.

By 1845 the issue had grown in emotional force, and the peace groups were divided. Whichever attitude one took toward abolition, he was bound to be attacked. Burritt, believing in abolition but not disunion, drew fire for his independence more than he might have, had he been able to go all the way, in a neat acquiescence, with either party.

Another source of friction was religion. Some leaders of the peace movement, on the whole, were liberal, however they appear to-day. But they were pietists, nevertheless, with a stern reverence for the Bible, for the Sabbath and for the church. With many of their followers that reverence was entirely without discrimination. Many a pacifist, not excluding William Ladd, was against war largely because of war's inevitable "Sabbath-breaking." They doubted whether those who supported war would land in any other than a Mohammedan heaven. They referred doubters of their cause to a literal interpretation of the Bible; and when alert skeptics queried their view in the light of Old Testament wars, they were forced to reply that war was one thing when God willed it and another when He showed it wrong. Here was an impossible logic, and their opponents were not slow to seize upon it.

The religious liberals in the peace societies were always suspect. Garrison, in particular, was as a red rag to the modern D.A.R. He had been charged by non-pacific abolitionists with dragging in an irrelevant cause; he was charged by the peace forces and abolitionists alike with dragging in a side issue whenever he wrote a word about the church. He was not a churchgoer, and he did not regard the clergy as any more divinely inspired than other men. He wrote and planned on Sunday.

When attacked on these points by a Boston clergyman he replied with heat that "No man who has not consecrated *all* his time to the service of God has ever consecrated a seventh part of it." "To say that everything contained within the lids of the Bible is divinely inspired," he replied to other critics, "and to insist upon this dogma as fundamentally important, is to give utterance to a bold fiction, and to require the suspension of the reasoning faculties." [6]

This sort of thing on the part of "the Liberator" and others, hindered the progress of peace work among literalists. As usual, the liberals were willing to work with the fundamentalists, but the latter would coöperate only when the others agreed with them. The Reverend J. N. Granger, of the First Baptist Church in Providence, Rhode Island, preached a sermon in 1846, which he published abroad with the following footnote:

> So far as I am acquainted with the doctrines and measures of the American Peace Society, I deem them to be *eminently christian;* and that is giving them the best name in my power to give. They are wise and safe, and if adhered to, must yet prevail. *But nothing can be more unlike them than what is taught* in most of the Peace Conventions, which have been held of late years in New England. . . . At a Peace Convention held in this city in January last, they told the objector that those accounts of David and Moses were contained in old Jewish writings, of doubtful age and authority; they were written, no one knew by whom or when, and were preserved no one knew how. . . . Now, for one, I am free to say, that I dread the loss of the Old Testament more than I dread *any* war.

Whereupon *The Advocate of Peace* hastened to reassure all and sundry that

> Our Society has never made itself responsible in any way for such sayings and doings as those complained of by Mr. Granger.

Burritt was devout as any; he was a Congregationalist but was little interested in denominationalism, theological hair-splitting, or sectarian polemics. He managed to keep out of any argument himself along such lines, but all around him the battle raged.

In this period fermenting with reform, the peace advocates

were almost to a man associated also in the growing movement against fermented drinks. There were no criticisms on this score. But over capital punishment and prison reform there were sharp differences. Dorothea Dix, a Quaker woman (1802-1887), had been agitating up and down the land, raising funds for improved insane asylums, and forcing state legislatures, which hated to heed a woman, to effect humane changes in prisons. Imprisonment for debt was on the wane; capital punishment was under fire. Miss Dix published her book on *Prisons and Prison Discipline* in 1845. Charles Spear, who had earlier brought out his *Essays on Imprisonment for Debt* began in 1845 the publication of his magazine *The Hangman* —which elicited from the *Boston Recorder* the prediction that "if the friends of that measure [i.e., abolition of executions] meet with success enough to save them from hanging themselves, it is all that ought to be expected." Some of the contributors to this journal (later *The Prisoner's Friend*) were Lydia Maria Child and Charles K. Whipple, both leaders of the Non-Resistant Society. Thomas C. Upham wrote for it, and Spear dedicated to Professor Upham his *Essays on the Punishment of Death,* which was brought out in 1844 and in four years had gone into ten editions.

Garrison owned this book; I have his copy (purchased for three dollars!) with the marginal notations. Hardly a page but what bears his careful marks of reference or exclamation —except, interestingly, the portion adducing evidence from the Sacred Scriptures!

Almost uniformly the radicals of the peace movement opposed capital punishment, while the conservatives were for it. David Dodge strongly condemned it; Noah Worcester, in 1820 cautiously published the opinion that "to prevent crime, it is not *sufficient* (my italics) to enact prohibitory laws, annexing the penalty of death." Ladd himself had expressed pleasure over the propaganda against capital punishment, and said in 1831:

We cannot believe, that men will be wide awake to the penalty, which a few of the worst criminals are compelled to pay to the

violated laws, and yet be blind to the death and suffering of myriads of those who, but for war, would have been good and great.

Two years later, Ladd—founder of the American Peace Society!—although favorable to the objects of the French Society of Christian Morals, notes that its work against the slave trade, capital punishment, etc., besides its central attack on war, had caused it to change until it had "too much lost sight of the intentions of the founder."

Others in the movement used the necessity of capital punishment as an argument in favor of upholding defensive war. Francis Fellowes was one; while editor of the Society's journal when it was called *The American Advocate of Peace,* he reviewed Upham's *Manual of Peace* and expressed dissent from the latter's view on capital punishment.

Burritt was one of the radicals on this as on most of the schismatic issues of the time. He referred to the death penalty as "cold-blooded, deliberate, legal homicide," and rated it as "diametrically opposed to revelation, reason, religion, and humanity."

The agitation accomplished a great deal in the reform of prison conditions; but it failed in regard to the crucial issue. Massachusetts, center of these reform efforts, is on record as responsible for the most inexcusable execution conceivable, in the summer of 1927; and in most of the country the final effort of that hundred years' campaign has yet to be made. Even as I write these words, almost, comes to hand a copy of the British pacifist paper, *No More War,* carrying inside a large blank for signatures to a petition asking the abolition of the death penalty.

This was a time when all Europe was seething with incipient revolution. That fact must not be forgotten when we perceive the nervousness of Americans over anything smacking of "anti-government." Many of our people had a fellow feeling with these revolutionists; some of them did not. This was also a time of war, and the emotion of national fealty was inhibitive.

But the radicals had never hesitated to summon rulers to the bar of judgment. Dodge was opposed to governments as constituted, "whose ultimate reliance is the sword"; he would never vote or hold office. Worcester was extraordinarily outspoken, even though he was not a thorough pacifist; he declared that although governments were better than formerly, "there must be either a change of policy in the existing governments, or they will be more and more exposed to the horrors of revolution"; and he did not hesitate to use widely Wordsworth's lines:

> Earth is sick,
> And Heaven is weary of the hollow words
> Which States and Kingdoms utter, when they speak
> Of Truth and Justice.

The Massachusetts Peace Society dryly remarked in its 1833 report, "We are not much inclined to rely on the sincerity of the general expressions of national rulers."

In 1840, however, Ladd apologized for the strong criticism of the Holy Alliance voiced by John A. Bolles in the latter's contribution to *Prize Essays on a Congress of Nations.*

The Declaration of the Non-Resistant Society had said that

> We cannot acknowledge allegiance to any human government; neither can we oppose any such government by a resort to physical force. . . . Our country is the world, our countrymen are all mankind. We love the land of our nativity only as we love all other lands. . . . The dogma, that all the governments of the world are approvingly ordained of God, and that THE POWERS THAT BE in the United States, in Russia, in Turkey, are in accordance with his will, is not less absurd than impious.

The Society took the same view as Dodge had taken earlier. Henry C. Wright, next to Garrison perhaps its prime mover, brought out in 1842 a pamphlet calling on all peace workers to forswear the ballot because the Federal Constitution made force binding on the government. One can see the strength of this appeal, logically; as far ahead as 1916 Lyman Abbot at Lake Mohonk was using this provision of the Constitution in an argument for strong preparedness. One can also see ample

reason why the American Peace Society on the whole decided it better to vote "early and often" for the champions of peace. They voted, however—as Wright did not fail to point out—on other than peace bases and supported politicians of scant peace sympathy.

Joshua P. Blanchard had to rebuke this tendency,[7] though he was the sort of radical who was forever seeking to patch up differences:

> An opinion appears very much to prevail among Christians, that the laws of Christianity were given for the regulation of internal character and domestic and social life; and not designed to be applied to states and nations, or to the conduct of men in their political capacity; and hence that they are not required, by any obligations of duty, to carry their religious principles before the rulers or parties of their land. . . .

He was referring especially to war, and the current war. Elihu Burritt also had his eye on Mexico when he concurred in what "someone has well said," namely, "that the welfare of *nations* is not always the welfare of governments." [8] He wrote pointedly, later, on *The Anarchy of Governments.*

Once, George Beckwith had not always been afraid to speak about government. He had written on *Peace and Government* and said strong things about war-making rulers. Now, however, he felt resentment at Burritt and the others, who were exposing to risk the organization he had kept going only by herculean labors.

Burritt, as editor of *The Advocate of Peace and Universal Brotherhood,* had an open ear to live ideas in any field; and he began to cause grave alarm after the first few numbers. With much of his work nearly everyone was in sympathy. He devised his *Olive Leaves for the People,* consisting of short pieces against war, which he translated into several languages and inserted in papers of various countries. He began publishing *The Bond of Brotherhood,* many thousands of copies being distributed free, by young men hired for the purpose, on trains, ferries, and other places where the "man in the street" could be reached. When the Oregon crisis threatened war, he organ-

ized his "Friendly International Addresses," bringing distinguished men and groups in England and the United States into a common effort to keep their countries out of war. These "addresses," in the form of messages, were given fair publicity, and could not be ignored, for they were signed by thousands here and across the water. One alone, from women of England, was signed by more than sixteen hundred while a reply by American women bore over thirty-five hundred signatures.

But it became increasingly plain to Beckwith and the other conservatives that Burritt was running the magazine as a pacifist publication. His pacifism was militant and it was often applied to the concrete crisis with Mexico. It hardly suited the taste of the more sensitive members to read such barbed sentiments as these, even though New England was cool to the conflict:

Patriotism. No one is ever called a *patriot* who gives his substance and his body to be burned or bruised in his efforts to relieve his country from the tyranny of vice, ignorance and moral degradation. Such are mere *fanatics.* A patriot is generally one who boasts how much of his country's blood he would see shed to wipe out an insult.

Laurels. Laurels are wreaths of weeds or green leaves wound around the forehead of a murderer.

The Halter. This is a stout cord of hemp to strangle a villain who contented himself with killing a single individual instead of a million.

The victory of the radicals in 1837 had given them hope. Adin Ballou, experimenter extraordinary and a man who was to impress the peace movement more later, perhaps, than now, published in 1846 his *Christian Non-Resistance,* stating far too optimistically that "it is a book for the future rather than the present, and will be better appreciated by the public half a century from now." Sumner had profoundly stirred New England in 1845 when he reared up his massive six feet four and thundered his florid but convincing arraignment of the war method. Minor spokesmen were not hesitating to attack the war: John Jackson of Philadelphia wrote a pamphlet which,

in 1917, would have sent him to jail for a ten-year term. Here and there, all over the North, courageous voices were raised. A test had come, and the radicals were ready.

On the twenty-fifth of May, 1846, the American Peace Society met at the Central Church in Boston. A number of resolutions were submitted, among them two which caused the liveliest debate. One of them read as follows:

> That we deeply lament, not only the actual collision of our Republic with Mexico, but also the outbursts of the war spirit in so many parts of our land, and the obvious, deplorable tendency of the existing war excitement to demoralize, more or less, the general mind of the nation, especially the lower classes and the rising generation.

This was followed by the other:

> That all good men should repudiate the doctrine which requires us to support our government, right or wrong, in any war it may choose to undertake; and he who aids or sanctions any war which he deems wrong, becomes confederate with its crimes, and violates the plainest precepts of Christianity, and of common morality.

The pacifists well knew how the majority were slipping and this was a bold effort to hold them to the principles of the Society since 1837.

The first speaker from the floor was Amasa Walker, Burritt's dearest friend, "father of the secret ballot law," and a man universally respected. Energetically emphasizing his words with movements of his tall, thin body, this man who was soon to be in the Massachusetts Legislature and Secretary of the Commonwealth, spoke without equivocation. Said he:

> We peace men can make no distinction; we are not traitors to our country, or blue light federalists; we will not maintain arguments upon this or that question of war; but we go against *all* war, for whatever purpose or under whatever pretext.

Burritt followed. He spoke with flowery rhetoric, yet with passion and directness. He paid particular attention to the peace society members who were already calling the war "defensive" and therefore just—the war described years after by General Grant as "an instance of a republic following the bad

example of European monarchies, in not considering justice in their desire to acquire additional territory." The "learned blacksmith" hammered away, gently but with unmistakable meaning:

> It may be imputed to fanaticism and ultraism, but it has come to this: that if the gospel forbids all war, then there never was, and never will be, a period when its demands were more imperative than now. . . . If we perforate the great law of love, which is to cement and bind together in harmony all races of men, even with so much as a bodkin, we make a hole large enough to admit all the fiends of the pit and deluge with blood the whole face of this beautiful green earth. . . . O! stupendous delusions are these defensive wars!

Followed the Reverend Frederick Holland of Rochester and Walter Channing, M.D., who backed up Walker and Burritt. A speaker in the gallery argued for war, whereupon rose Stephen Foster, keen, brilliant, biting as a north wind yet not unwinsome—about whom James Russell Lowell wrote whimsical verses and described as

> A man with caoutchouc endurance,
> A perfect gem for life insurance;
> A kind of maddened John the Baptist,
> To whom the harshest word comes aptest.
> Who, struck by stone or brick ill-starred,
> Hurls back an epithet as hard,
> Which, deadlier than stone or brick,
> Has a propensity to stick.
> His oratory is like a scream
> Of the iron horse's frenzied steam,
> Which warns the world to leave a space
> For the black engine's swerveless race.

It was a quiet but determined Foster who demolished the war plea, and even criticized the praise given by one resolution to the press and clergy as purely diplomatic and out of accord with the facts (a most obviously correct opinion). But to no avail. Silent were those who could find no answer, except on prudential grounds; but they were in a majority and they knew it. The meeting was adjourned until the following day.

Certain is it that between night and dawn many a job of fixing was done. When the matter came to a head the radical resolutions lost; and by a vote of nearly ten to one these were adopted in their stead:

1. That the Society in accordance with its Constitution, as it has ever done, will confine itself strictly to the single object of abolishing International War.
2. That the Society be so managed as to be kept entirely distinct from anti-government, from the question of Capital Punishment, and all other extraneous subjects, as it has heretofore been.
3. That, for varied reasons, having been confounded by not a few in the community, with such questions, it should take special care to guard against this in the future.
4. That the basis of the First General Peace Convention in London, 1843, viz., "the inconsistency of war with Christianity and the true interests of mankind," be regarded as the proper basis of co-operation in the cause of Peace;—that all persons willing for any reason to labor for the abolition of this custom, be, as they have been from the origin of the Society, invited, whatever their views respecting defensive wars, to unite with us in this enterprise; and that the Society be conducted in a way to render such co-operation practicable, consistent, and cordial, by not conflicting in its operations with principles, institutions or interests which the Christian community hold dear and sacred.[9]

Burritt and the radicals were thus rebuked; Beckwith and the conservatives had won. The next step was to broach the question of a change in the constitution to remove the radical explanatory clause of 1837. The safe and sane, bent on letting nothing interfere with numerical and financial support, lost no time. Fearing to lose Ladd's legacy, they finally decided not to change the constitution itself; but allowed the explanatory clause to be dropped and the new resolutions to be reaffirmed at the next annual meeting.

At the June meeting of the Executive Committee Burritt and certain others presented their resignations. Among these were S. E. Coues, President of the Society; Walter Channing, M.D.; Amasa Walker; E. W. Jackson; Benjamin D. Peck; J. P. Blanchard; Thomas Drown; and J. L. Baker.

Burritt was soon abroad. Disillusioned, lured by many ap-

peals to come to England, where his fame was not slight, he had sailed in late May for a three months' visit. He had stayed on, as we shall see.

He had been warmly but quietly received; his public successes were yet to come. Needing still to keep out-of-doors, he walked about the countryside as he had planned before his crossing. A strange sight he must have presented as he went through the little hamlets making friends with the children and the birds, of whom he was equally fond; velvet-collared frock coat, tall hat, choker collar open slightly at the throat, wide, thin mouth, curling hair almost as natural as life, umbrella over his shoulder, and suspended from the umbrella handle over his back a large "Boston" bag of shiny black, filled with his scant personal articles, a book or two, and the inevitable diary.

On July 27, 1846, that diary reveals that he had caught a new vision. He had become impressed with the idea of brotherhood as a way of life, long since, and had added *and Universal Brotherhood* to *The Advocate of Peace*. Now he inscribed:

> Wrote a pledge for a League of Universal Brotherhood—hope to get a thousand signatures to it before I leave the country.

The realization of that hope to an amazing multiplication, then the subordination of the League to more exciting, spectacular (and, I fear, less dynamic) adventures, will be related in the following chapter. Here we must examine the pledge—a bold and daring document:

> Believing all war to be inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity, and destructive of the best interests of mankind, I do hereby pledge myself never to enlist or enter into any army or navy, or to yield any voluntary support or sanction to any war, by whomsoever or for whatsoever proposed, declared or waged. And I do hereby associate myself with all persons, of whatever country, color, or condition, who have signed, or who shall hereafter sign, this pledge, in a League of Universal Brotherhood, whose object shall be, to employ all legitimate and moral means for the abolition of all war, and all the spirit and manifestations of war throughout the world; for the abolition of all restrictions upon international correspondence and friendly intercourse, and

of whatever else tends to make enemies of nations, or prevents their fusion into one peaceful brotherhood; for the abolition of all institutions and customs which do not recognize and respect the image of God and a human brother in every man, of whatever clime, color, or condition of humanity.

When this movement was launched and began to be reflected through the American Peace Society's journal—which Burritt edited from abroad with the aid of his "faithful Ezekiel," Thomas Drew, Jr., at Worcester—the disgust of the conservatives was boundless. Would this man never stay in his place?

Up to now, the general public, and probably the membership at large, were unaware that a split had occurred. The time had come to make the schism definite, public, irrevocable, and no longer to leave in the hands of Beckwith at home the privilege of explaining it.

Not without reluctance but with a firm conviction that the step was necessary, the leaders of the radical wing announced their resignation through the final issue of *The Advocate* under Burritt's control (December, 1846):

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

Gent,—The undersigned ask leave to resign the offices, which through your confidence, they have long held in the American Peace Society;—feeling assured that the reasons they now give, will fully justify them in the course which they feel compelled to take.

The Society, under its constitution, assumes and declares that all international war, without reference to its character or object, is opposed to christianity. It makes no distinction between what are called offensive or defensive wars, but opposes the military spirit as the very opposite of the christian spirit. This is the platform, not of this society only, but so far as we know, of every peace society. It is the common sentiment of the most active friends of peace throughout the world. So prevalent is it, that within a few weeks, many thousand persons in England and in the United States have signed a pledge, binding themselves never "to yield any voluntary support or sanction to the preparation for, or prosecution of any war, by whomsoever, or for whatsoever proposed, declared or waged." And these thousands are, if we may be allowed a military figure, but the advance guard

of the great army of the soldiers of Christ now enrolling themselves to contend for the peace of the world. The day of doubt and fear to the friends of peace has passed away.

Under these circumstances an attempt is made by some of our associates, to change the fundamental principles of our society, and to place it upon lower ground. It is said by those desirous of the change, that the radical position of the society narrows its influence, closes pulpits to its lectures, and prevents the hearty cooperation of "the moderate friends of peace."

We are opposed to this change. We believe that no increase of members can compensate for the loss of the high christian principle which alone can give real and permanent strength. The opinion of men in general, of governments, even of soldiers, is already that war is an evil, and to be waged only where absolutely necessary. In a society for reform, of what use are numbers, who are gained by sinking it down to the opinions of those whom it seeks to elevate?

The question between us and our former associates of the Executive Committee, is not, whether christianity, under any circumstances, tolerates international war, but whether the *Society* can be most efficient with or without asserting the radical principle. Our minds are clear on the subject, and we cannot in justice to our own views of duty, retain office in a society which abandons the principle that *all* war is forbidden by christianity.

Nor do we think that the matter can be settled by discussion in a public meeting of the society. The opinions of those most deeply interested cannot be changed by votes. It is not a question for a majority to decide, leaving a dissatisfied minority in the executive board. The society should be organized definitely and distinctly on the one ground or on the other. We therefore retire, that there may be harmony in the direction of the society, and that they who differ from us may fairly test the value of the change. We are ready to make the sacrifice, leaving to those who differ from us all the advantages of the old organization. The cause of peace, so far from losing, will gain by this procedure. The society under the more lax constitution will fairly try the experiment, and we who retire will increase our exertions to spread abroad the noble christian sentiment which animates our hearts.

We have another reason for our resignation of office. It has been often alleged that the position of some of us, as the avowed opponents of capital punishment tends to injure the society, and such have been requested to resign on that account. A large number of persons were called together at the last anniversary of the society, for the declared purpose of "placing the cause of peace

aright before the christian public." The charge then made against the administration of the society was, that we had mingled other reforms with the cause of peace. Upon a strict investigation, this charge was withdrawn, and a vote was passed, exonerating the officers of the society from the imputation of doing anything in their official capacity to advance other reforms. But it is still asserted, and perhaps with truth, that the position of some of us individuals, in regard to capital punishment, injures the society; that men will not separate individual acts from official conduct. By retiring from office, we remove this obstacle to the hearty cooperation in the American Peace Society of those in favor of capital punishment.

We assure our former associates, that between them and us there can be no rivalry or contention. We part with them with kindly feelings, wishing them success in every effort they may make for peace, and confidently expect from them their kind wishes in our behalf. We form no new organization to contend with the old; and, radical as we are supposed to be, we oppose no sect, no denomination, no institution. We would elevate the christian ministry, not attempt to lessen its influence. We would strengthen the church, for we are not unmindful of the good it has done and continues to do. On the christian religion we build our hopes of the peace of the world, and we have no confidence in any attempt for reform which is not made in the spirit of love. War is contrary to the spirit of Christ; we believe it expressly forbidden by his precepts. We therefore raise our voices against all war, against all preparations for war, and against every manifestation of the military spirit; yet we would not reject the aid of those who do not fully coincide with us in this belief; the cause of peace requires the efforts of all those who profess themselves her friends; but we have no faith in any principle or policy which tolerates for any purpose whatever that which is opposed to the spirit of christianity. Good can never come from disobedience to the precepts of the Prince of Peace.

Samuel E. Coues,
Elihu Burritt,
Walter Channing,
E. W. Jackson,
Benjamin D. Peck,
Amasa Walker,
J. P. Blanchard,
Thomas Drown,
J. L. Baker.

Burritt's own account of his stewardship as editor acknowledges that the conservative policy will bring in more members, for "few, we imagine, in the civilized world, would be ex-

cluded from its fellowship." He closed with these powerful words:

> Peace is a spirit, and not an intellectual abstraction; it is a life, not a theory.

The radicals were out of power; "safe and sane" would be the watchwords from now on.

The stone that the builders rejected has never yet become the head of the corner.

Neither, though, has the temple of peace been securely built.

CHAPTER XVIII

TRIAL—AND ERROR

Recall the effect produced by the firing upon Sumter. The Northern heart was paralyzed. Dejection sat upon every countenance. Business stagnated. Property diminished in value. The national heart was faint. The generous impulses of that heart were opposed to war. The nation itself paused—thoughtfully paused. But party interrupted the thoughtful silence, and lifted its voice in flattery and cajolery. Ninety days, it said, with a few thousand men, would put down the rebellion and elevate the political morality. Speakers were sent over the land, making partisan appeals and creating a "war-feeling." Then the thoughtful pause was broken. Reason was dethroned. Thence one wild scream for war echoed in trumpet tones from one end of the land to the other. Old and young, saint and sinner, male and female, were seized by the dire contagion, and thrown into paroxysms of rage. Nay, the penitent utterances of prayer were suffused with explosions of wrathful passion. Even the Quakers were not exempt from the storm of contagion, and many of them were hurled into the ranks of the army. The Peace Societies of the land were laid prostrate before the first gust, and so continued during the beating of the whole wild storm.—Passage marked as of special interest by William Lloyd Garrison, in his personal copy of *Reason versus the Sword* (1873), by JOHN M. WASHBURN.

CHAPTER XVIII

TRIAL—AND ERROR

From the captured capital of far-off Mexico General Scott wrote of the approach to the coveted city; wrote with what must have seemed back in the States a tone of lyric ecstasy:

> Descending a long western slope, a magnificent basin, with, near its centre, the object of all our hopes, toils and dangers—once the gorgeous seat of the Montezumas, now the capital of a great republic—first broke upon our enchanted view. The close-surrounding lakes, sparkling under a bright sun, seemed, in the distance, pendant diamonds. The numerous steeples, of great beauty and elevation, with Popacatapetl, ten thousand feet higher, apparently near enough to touch with the hand, filled the mind with religious awe.

That feeling did not last too long, for:

> Recovering from the sublime trance, probably not a man in the column failed to say to his neighbor or himself, That splendid city shall soon be ours! All were ready to suit the action to the word.[1]

Albert Pike, commander of a squadron of cavalry in that war, and Brigadier General of the Confederacy in the War of Secession, also grew poetic. His poem, "Buena Vista," is little known to-day, but was widely used at the time; in ballad style it shows the spirit of the warring masses:

> Still, still our glorious banner waves,
> unstained by flight or shame,
> And the Mexicans among their hills
> still tremble at our name.

This was not an ideal calculated to satisfy the recreant pacifists of the North. The words of apology for the war, as it proceeded, came to stick nauseatingly in their throats. Oppo-

sition to the conflict was being expressed more vigorously by those outside the peace societies than by peace men themselves. They began to recover their nerve and sought to ward off the sting of the radicals' rebuke by sturdier anti-war activity. The Massachusetts Legislature in April, 1847, voted that the war (which was still under way) had been "unconstitutionally commenced by the order of the President . . . for the dismemberment of Mexico, and for the conquest of a portion of her territory, from which slavery has already been excluded, with the triple object of extending slavery, of strengthening the 'Slave Power,' and of obtaining the control of the Free States under the Constitution of the United States."

It was Charles Sumner who, as one of a legislative committee, had drafted a daringly outspoken (and perhaps not wholly fair) minority report; and to the amazement of the majority on the committee, this report was adopted by a vote of about two to one—the resolutions calling for the withholding of supplies and the withdrawal of troops![2]

Consequently, in the following month, even the American Peace Society summoned courage to vote

> That the present war with Mexico, with all its crimes and woes, is a pretty fair specimen of the custom itself, as a compound of wickedness and folly.

Such an action came all too late. A body which trails and does not lead rarely sees people in general follow a revival of its leadership. That the conservative victory had not brought new life is shown by the May-June *Advocate of Peace,* which reported that

> Our Secretary has been for the most part engaged of late in New York and Philadelphia, in both which cities we need, and hope in due time to have, efficient auxiliaries. We have in each a number of able and devoted friends; but they have not as yet formed any organization sufficient to call forth the latent peace principle and zeal diffused through those communities.

In the summer of 1846 the Society wrote letters and sent petitions to Washington urging that the war be ended, and sig-

natures were solicited at street meetings in Boston and Portsmouth; but these efforts, as the report of them sets forth, "however courteously received, were apparently disregarded." Why should they not have been? At that stage of the adventure the Administration, whatever it did, had every reason to count on no real opposition from the peace movement. The movement was not only small; it had no backbone.

A prize of five hundred dollars was offered for the best summary of the war, when it should be ended, from a Christian view; the winning volume, by the Reverend A. A. Livermore, is a fine and fearless piece of work. But it was brought out in 1849, long after the smoke had rolled away. Hindsight is not only better, but often more unflinching, than foresight.

The feud within the ranks had not subsided with the passing of the pacifists. Beckwith, in the first issue of *The Advocate* again under his editorship, renewed the attack of sneer and innuendo.

The Conservatives Attack

Former President Coues and some of the other radicals did not leave the Society utterly, remaining as members to show their coöperative spirit so long as they were relieved of responsibility for policies. Beckwith announced this with a grudging satisfaction, expressing "regret that anyone should regard the Society's course as not sufficiently radical"—though he would have been ten times as regretful if it had been criticized on the opposite score! His choler led him to distortion: he asked that all who received the paper should consider it a questionnaire to ascertain whether members wished to exclude "moderate peace men"—not an honest presentation of the issue at all.

Beckwith lashed Burritt for saying that

> there is no disqualifying reason why the Mexican and American soldiers who stabbed at each other's hearts in the streets of Monterey, might not alternately subscribe to the highest article of faith remaining in the Society's creed, and that too with the points of their bayonets newly dipped in human blood! [3]

Burritt's League of Universal Brotherhood evoked merely

derision from Beckwith, who saw it grow only with increased bitterness:

> Here, then, comes another catholicon—the doctrine of Universal Brotherhood. I like the general idea very much, as one familiar to my mind, and dear to my heart; one that teems with high relations, and world-wide influences for good; one that I have long cherished and advocated as an auxiliary to peace; one, too, that will bear, like pure gold, to be hammered out, till it covers the whole surface of our common humanity. All this and a great deal more, I can honestly say in its favor; but as a practical measure, or a system of instrumentalities for the promotion of peace, or any other single object, I hardly know what it means.
>
> It is a fine conception, but altogether too vague and broad for any specific purpose. It covers everything in general, but fixes necessarily on nothing in particular. It is no more adapted to war than it is to famine or the slave trade and might as properly erect itself into a Bible or a Missionary Society, as into one for Peace. It is one of those vague, magnificent generalities, which for a time enrapture persons of a sanguine, excitable temperament. . . .

This was a time when Beckwith was getting out a "moderate" *Peace Manual,* using almost the same title as Upham's radical *Manual of Peace;* the tamer booklet was in use by the Society as late as 1869.

Burritt's Movement Grows

There appeared to be an alarming number of people with excitable temperaments, for the League of Universal Brotherhood grew like a mushroom—too fast, in fact, for its own well-being. Such "excitable" people as Coues, Walter Channing, Amasa Walker, Upham, and Gerrit Smith were officers; Samuel J. May was a member, as was Andrew Preston Peabody—Unitarian minister, later editor of *The North American Review* and a professor at Harvard. At the League's first annual meeting in Tremont Temple, May 31 and June 1, 1848, delegates were present from almost every state in the Union. Numbers of missionaries joined, and thus its roll extended to South America and the Sandwich (Hawaiian) Islands. Meetings were held on the average about six a week, counting

the whole United States. The New England Conference of Wesleyan Methodists, "a large and influential body," at its session in Duxbury, Massachusetts, in 1847, voted to advise

> that the Conference adopt "The League of Universal Brotherhood" [remember, this was in war-time], sign it individually, and also that it be presented at an early period to all our churches for their signatures.[5]

Burritt's "faithful Ezekiel," Thomas Drew, labored like a Trojan to keep hot the anvil of public interest. Signatures were printed, several hundred at a time, in *The Christian Citizen.* On one occasion Drew wrote across the water to his editor-in-chief:

> My poor old brain-box has at last given out, and for a fortnight past I have had a constant and violent pain in the head, which has prevented me from doing anything.[6]

Interest in the radical peace declaration was not confined to the East. One of the hotbeds of pacifism was Oberlin, Ohio. The college and town fathers were not very keen about so radical a project; but "the people heard it gladly." Burritt called it the "banner town," the spot which had produced a greater proportionate number of signers than any other—seven hundred, or more than half the population of the village! Amos Dresser, famous as the abolitionist who had in 1835 been flogged in the public square at Nashville, Tennessee, was a ringleader in this movement. A report from Oberlin to Burritt indicates how matters stood in many a place:

> I carry on a cobbler's shop here [as educational self-support], but my mind refuses to be contained in it. It will fly away and perch itself upon the Peace Cause. I am willing to be a hewer of wood and a drawer of water to promote it. We have a few more than 700 signers of the pledge in Oberlin. I have not collected quite all, but most of them, and that in the face of the leading influences. I concluded, if I caught the sheep, the shepherds would be likely to follow.[7]

"No moral end can be obtained by demoralizing means," said Burritt; and the English people often flocked to hear him

elaborate his thesis. Many times the meetings overflowed. His "Columbus of Universal Brotherhood," as he had called it, seemed to have struck new lands. How small a comprehension of his plan was Beckwith's! Soon after the League's inception, Burritt had declared:

> Its operations and influence will not be confined to the work of mere *abolition;* as if nothing more were requisite for the symmetrical development of society, or the universal growth of human happiness, than the axe to be laid to the root of existing evils. It will seek to build up, as well as to pull down; to sow, as well as to eradicate; to water and warm into life, as well as to pluck up by the roots and to burn. It contemplates something more than a mere Peace Society, or the object of inducing nations merely to abstain from war, or to leave each other alone. It will not only aim at the mutual pacification of enemies, but at their conversion into brethren. In fact, the largest class of its operations will be more remedial, educational, and upbuilding, than destructive; being based upon the whole compass of the principle, that every man is bound to be as much a brother, as God is a father, to every human being, however deep may be the moral darkness and degradation of that being; however fallen or low in the estimation of the world he may be by crime or color, or any condition of humanity within or beyond his control. Long after nations shall have been taught to learn war no more, long after the mere iron fetters shall have been stricken from the limbs of the last slave, and every visible yoke shall have been broken, and every formal bastile of oppression levelled with the ground, there will be a work for the League.[8]

How many signers there were altogether in England and the United States, cannot be stated with exactness. In England there were more than thirty thousand, and in the United States a minimum of twenty-five thousand, while in Holland and elsewhere on the Continent several hundred more signatures were obtained.

If Burritt had been six men and the program of getting hundreds of thousands of members had been adhered to, the League as such would loom larger in history. Its spirit was carried on, but its leadership was diverted by events far out of pacifist control. Eventually it was amalgamated with the London Peace Society, and Burritt's energies, though still for

brotherhood, were demanded for new projects that moved swiftly and far beyond his dreams.

If autocrats and empires ever knew how to yield to the insistence of progress, the League of Universal Brotherhood might have expanded enough and might sufficiently have worked out a pacifist technique of social change to have prevented not only wars of the nations but of the classes. No alternative to violence was Burritt able to present, however, save patience, near-submission, and fortitude in the face of things as they were.

The European Revolutions

For that matter, the Continent had heard little or nothing about the League or its ideas. In France a revolutionary people restored the Republic in 1848. In England the repeal of the Corn Laws was effected in 1846. In Austria of 1848 Metternich was unhorsed, while Ferdinand I abdicated, Franz-Joseph succeeded to the throne, and, in 1849, a new constitution went into operation. In Germany, successive waves of revolt eventuated in a constitution for Prussia, but the crushing of open revolution in Dresden, Baden, and the Palatinate. Spain was still unsettled from the civil war of 1833 between absolutism and constitutionalism. The Swiss Confederacy was changed, in 1847, to a federal union. In 1848, Naples and Sicily were the scenes of revolutionary uprisings; Lombardy and Venice also rebelled against Austrian rule and a republic was established, temporarily, at Rome. In Greece incipient revolution was manifest, though it held off until 1862.

With most of these movements the American people were in sympathy. The Standard Oil Company was still almost twenty years off; not yet had the near-monopolization of business and industry entered into men's dreams, and if it had, they would have thought it a nightmare. A small but loud handful of the Democrats were yelling for armed intervention by this country to aid the revolutionists.

Eager to carry into the heart of these disturbances his message of peace, and actuated by a horror of a huge general

war which was never far from probability, Burritt went to France to organize, if he could, an international peace congress.

How simple that sounds—how tame and how inadequate! The first international peace congress, that of 1843, had been held at the instigation of Joseph Sturge, the English humanitarian, in London. Chief emphasis was put on the means of securing peace, and only conservative proposals, particularly Judge William Jay's plan for "stipulated arbitration," were considered. A congress of nations was endorsed, along with a court; peace education was advised, and also the formation of peace societies among "the working classes." Anti-preparedness sentiment and opposition to military training in schools and colleges were strongly in evidence; the help of women was asked. Beckwith had been there, along with some thirteen other Americans. Richard Cobden came as an English observer. Nearly one hundred and fifty people were present at the sessions. Some opposition and fun poking were indulged in by the press; but on the whole it appeared to be a fairly safe, abstract,—and uninfluential—affair.

But a conference in France was a different matter. The revolutionary government feared the masses, who were already aggrieved because it did not aid the Italian revolution; and it was not eager to add any new factor to a situation fraught with the danger of imminent explosion. Leaders of French communism in return for any support to Burritt, demanded endorsement of industrial nationalization—which the peace movement, Burritt well knew, would not permit and which he did not believe in himself. Colonel A. Dudley Mann, American attaché, instead of giving encouragement, was on the contrary a war enthusiast anxious to involve the United States.

Nor were the peace forces back home in the States of one clear mind. A heavy percentage, while disbelieving in international war were willing to back up a revolution. Others, Beckwith among them, were unstable and fluctuated with public sentiment. Until the revolutions failed, Beckwith held that the constitution of the American Peace Society had nothing to do with internal conflicts, and so it was all right to support

these civil rebellions. This amazing leader, when our own government was confronted with a "rebellion," was to use the same excuse for reliance on force to suppress the very principle of self-determination he upheld in Europe!

Burritt's heart was genuinely with the toilers, with Labor, "that had walked and worked her way through the barbarisms and feudalisms of the past, with the fetter prints of bondage still fresh and crimson round her limbs," Labor, "come to her immortal *now,* to the day of her august coronation." He could grow bitterly sarcastic at times about the difference in standards between those who earned a living and those who owned one. "If a seamstress takes 3000 stitches in a seam of one yard in length for two cents," he once inquired, "what would be the length of the seam she would have to sew to buy a boa at 16 dollars?" [9] He ran articles by working-class spokesmen; and was not frightened by the idea of a general strike against war. But he had no faith in the war method as an instrument of liberation.

Professor M. E. Curti has interestingly described Burritt's adventure in France:

> What with the nervous discontent of the Paris clubs and workshops and the rumors of plots against the provisional government, no one probably paid much attention on the morning of August 23, 1848, to the American making his way past the liberty trees in the squares and the recently barricaded streets to the quarters of the American legation. How well his alert blue eyes and pleasantly turned mouth and abundant enthusiasm concealed tiredness, frailty and a wretched, persistent illness! A shrewd workman might perhaps have guessed that this awkward and modest man had swung a hammer on an anvil, but scarcely anyone would have surmised that he had mastered almost as many languages as he had lived out years. His own thoughts, indeed, were far from these things, far too from his personal poverty, discouragements and rebuffs. He, Elihu Burritt, had come as a messenger of peace to the revolutionary people of France, but they seemed far from ready for his message. Each day it was driven home to him how fundamental the antagonism between the revolutions and pacifism really was. How unfortunate, he was probably thinking, if fear of cannon should keep his British fellows from undertaking the journey across the Channel to attend the peace congress he was planning! [10]

He was doomed to disappointment; so long did the government withhold permission for the congress that he knew it was a hopeless venture. To Brussels then he went, and there the Belgian government was responsive and helpful. After preliminary public meetings in England, the Brussels Peace Conference was held in September, 1848, with an average delegated attendance of about three hundred, among whom was only one from the United States, besides Burritt himself. Burritt again pressed for a congress of nations and a pacific codification of international law. The Brussels conference was given wide publicity, as usual a small part of the press seeing in it a blessing and the rest a menace.

By 1849 the tension in France had relaxed considerably, and Burritt again proceeded to form plans for a conference at Paris. He raised the necessary funds, and secured the support of influential progressives in France and especially in England. To the 1849 congress came many celebrities. Richard Cobden led a British delegation of six hundred and seventy. Victor Hugo presided and launched his ringing plea for a United States of Europe. A score of delegates came from Burritt's home country. The public meetings were large, reaching two thousand in attendance.

So successful was this meeting that Burritt and his associates decided to try one at militaristic Frankfort in 1850. Our ex-blacksmith returned to the States for a few months, to work up interest in this daring project. Again the energy of Burritt could not be denied, and a large conference was the result. It voted in favor of arbitration, the codification of international law, and disarmament; and against war, duelling, intervention by one state in the affairs of another, and the extension of loans to countries at war.

It turned down a request from Schleswig-Holstein to mediate its difference with Denmark. But three men were there who, though not expecting to be able to do much, nevertheless were game to try. Elihu Burritt, Joseph Sturge and Frederick Wheeler went into the center of conflict, labored with dignitaries, persuaded the Danish government to accept mediation.

Burritt stayed three months in Hamburg dealing with Schleswig-Holstein; but just as things were smoothing out, troops marched in and settled the whole matter by the "mediation" of arms.

Burritt, mind you, was not only undertaking chief responsibility for these conferences. He was instrumental in organizing relief during the terrible Irish famine. He was beginning an ultimately successful agitation for "ocean penny postage." He was expanding the work of his *Olive Leaves.* These little four-page leaflets, bearing a dove returning with the olive leaf of promise in its bill, were translated and used in forty papers in Germany, France, Sweden, Denmark, Spain, Austria, Holland and Italy, in space purchased with funds given by various contributors. He was building up the influence of *The Bond of Brotherhood,* until he estimated that every issue reached over one hundred thousand young people. The *cause* of peace, he said, had now become the peace *movement,* "in the sense of activity and universality."

Another conference was held in London, in 1851, and was even more largely attended, with fifteen representatives of French organized labor. But the 1852 congress was given up. Why? Because the French Republic, born of violence, became once more an Empire, and in France and England an armament race was under way. Every effort was made—in the ancient method, however, of mere supplication—to prevent the arms increases, but it was of no use. The next year, heady and deaf to pleas for peace, Great Britain joined in the Crimean War between Russia and Turkey. The Lion and the Bear came to grips until the fur flew; while the dove of peace went into seclusion.

Autocracy in Peace

Meantime, back home, affairs in the American Peace Society were far from flourishing. Beckwith was a worker; but he was a tyrant. He could raise funds from conservatives—who, as a rule, were the ones who had it; but he spent it as he pleased, and not always in the judgment of many as wisely or

as fairly as he might. Joshua P. Blanchard resigned as treasurer in 1847. At the annual meeting in 1851 it was necessary to appoint a committee to investigate the financial system (Beckwith was never remotely thought dishonest; he was implicitly trusted by all in that regard) and also to look into the charge that the Society had become a one-man organization.

Blanchard, though mainly engaged in business, was a prolific writer; he contributed to many journals. In an old leather-bound scrapbook which still bore the entries of a colonial stationer in pounds and shillings, he pasted his printed treasures and inserted unprinted manuscripts in his even, delicate hand. Among them is a copy of a letter he sent to every member of the Society. It presents a view of the situation which directly challenges the reports in *The Advocate of Peace.* In the journal, Beckwith had misstated the financial situation so as to discredit Blanchard, who had labored as faithfully as ever, although fourteen hundred dollars in back salary was due him and he had taken the place at first, "resigning a remunerative position," only when assured that if he did not the Society was doomed. Beckwith also had utilized the chance to make it seem that the meeting had been very disorderly, which Blanchard denied. Nobody could easily learn what the real trouble was about, and most of the writers I have read accept the *ex parte* statements in *The Advocate* as facts.

Facts they certainly are not. Allowing for a liking of Blanchard and a distrust of Beckwith, I have checked these accounts against each other. Beckwith's statements simply do not ring true and are evasive; whereas Blanchard's appear irrefutable, in fact all the stronger when Beckwith's subsequent explanations are examined. But by a slender plurality, Beckwith was sustained and Blanchard's party rejected.

What was the reason? It was because the old quarrel was still alive; the conservatives were now determined to root out every last radical. They did so; and Beckwith was left to rule or ruin.

He found the former none too easy. He was obliged to carry a heavy burden, heavier than he had anticipated. In 1855 he

suffered a breakdown. Who, then, came to the Society's rescue? No one else than Blanchard, who carried the load, even to editing *The Advocate* for almost a year, without the slightest charge for his services. Blanchard and Beckwith had once trusted each other more fully; the former, connected with the Eagle Bank, had arranged for the surreptitious meeting there in 1838, when the conservatives plotted to head off the Garrison non-resistants, and he had been a member of the American Peace Society's executive committee which repudiated that convention. Now, though more radical, he could not bear to let a quarrel sink the organization.

But the Society was in no moral condition to meet any strain upon its ebbing *esprit de corps.* As the conflict between North and South drew to a climax, it is amazing to think how little attempt was made by the Society to head it off.

Compensated Emancipation

Burritt tried. He had been pushed into new fields of action by the Mexican War. He had come back for a short time in the interest of his peace congresses. In 1853 he came home again, "lobbying" in Washington for his cheap postage bill, sponsored by Sumner, and speaking on its behalf through the South, the West, the East, and even in Canada. He went once more to England, but a short stay convinced him that with the Crimean War under way he could do little there. He came back to his United States, and found a condition verging closer and closer on open combat. At once he set about the task of war prevention. Even while still in England he had edited a little paper, *The Citizen of the World,* which was issued at Philadelphia and which advocated his scheme of "compensated emancipation." For several seasons after his return he traveled in promotion of his plan, going almost ten thousand miles in one winter. In brief, Burritt's proposal involved the sale of public lands, the proceeds from which were to be used in buying the slaves. Over a thousand people throughout the country signed a call for a convention to forward the project.

In August, 1856, at Cleveland the convention took place and

the National Compensated Emancipation Co. was formed. Its President was Dr. Eliphalet Nott of Union College; Governor Fairchild of Vermont, Dr. Mark Hopkins of Williams College, and others were made Vice Presidents; and Burritt was chosen as Secretary. From a little office in the Bible House in New York—often since the headquarters of altruistic societies—the advocate of the scheme directed a series of regional conferences, wrote a stream of letters to the press, and went forth to speak. Southern papers gave space to the proposal, but had no faith in the willingness of the North to make so substantial a pecuniary sacrifice.

In the North Burritt argued that Northerners were not so pure as they seemed in their record; that it had become inevitable for them, in their industrial situation, to give up slavery; that the slave system was something for which the whole nation was responsible. He had the wit to perceive, as many of the more self-righteous ones above the Mason and Dixon Line could not, the essential truth which has recently been uttered by a present-day historian:

> Slavery never became general in New England because the industries of that region required intelligent, skillful labor, not because public sentiment condemned the institution as a moral evil.[11]

There were almost as many freed Negroes in the South as in the North, though not in population percentage, of course. Many Northern men actually owned Southern plantations or heavy acreage in Cuba, worked by slaves. Up to the Missouri Compromise there were not far from a hundred anti-slavery societies in the South. Burritt could not overlook such factors as these.

He brought down on his head only contempt from the abolitionists. Garrison labeled his plan, in tones of outraged cocksureness, "preposterous." This puny movement appears like an effort to put out a forest fire with a thimble of water. Yet it reached more proportions, at least, than historians have ascribed to it (when they have mentioned it at all). Many petitions for

compensated emancipation were presented to the Senate by Sumner and William H. Seward, and by others to the House. Hearings were being arranged. Said Burritt, later:

But just as it had reached that stage at which Congressional action was about to recognize it as a legitimate proposition, "John Brown's raid" suddenly closed the door against all overtures or efforts for the peaceful extinction of slavery. Its extinction by compensated emancipation would have recognized the moral complicity of the whole nation in planting and perpetuating it on this continent. It would have been an act of repentance, and the meetest work for repentance the nation could perform. But it was too late. It was too heavy and red to go out in tears. Too late! It had to go out in blood, and the whole nation opened the million sluices of its best life to deepen and widen the costly flood. If, before these sluice-gates were opened to these red streams, so hot with passion, one *bona fide* offer had been made by the North to share with the South the task, cost, and duty of lifting slavery from the bosom of the nation, perhaps thousands who gave up their first-born and youngest-born to death might have looked into that river of blood with more ease and comfort at their hearts. Although the earth has drunk that red river out of human sight, it still runs fresh and full, without the waste of a drop, before the eyes of God; and the patriot, as well as Christian, might well wish that he could recognize in the stream the shadow of an honest effort on the part of the North to lift the great sin and curse without waiting for such a deluge to sweep them away.[12]

As late as August, 1864, Lincoln appears to have considered compensation seriously (for the Union slaveholders) and discussed it at the White House with a visitor.[13] His bill of April, 1862, for emancipation in the District of Columbia, provided for compensation ranging from one hundred to three hundred dollars per slave (to all slave owners who were loyal to the Union).

In his message of March 6, 1862, the President recommended that Congress pass a resolution as follows: "That the United States, in order to coöperate with any State which may adopt gradual abolition of slavery, give to such State pecuniary aid, to be used by such State in its discretion, to compensate it for the inconvenience, public and private, produced by such change of system"; and it was so voted.

In most of the places where slavery had been abolished compensation had been given, even by Great Britain to its colonial slaveholders in the sum of twenty million pounds sterling, though feeling was strong against them.

Whether or not compensated emancipation was at all practicable is a matter for the economist to settle. With all of Burritt's mastery of mathematics, it is doubtful if he saw more than dimly the economic problem in its tremendous ramifications. He, like the abolitionists and most of the reform groups, interpreted the conflict largely in moral terms. Moral it was; but basically the North, home of a boisterous young capitalism, was encroaching on the agricultural South, which was willing to use every last weapon to maintain its integrity and fling back, as a broom against the ocean's breakers, the inevitable industrial penetration.

Ten years before the Civil War Beckwith's annual report recognized, "with much satisfaction and hope, the indications of a growing interest in the question of Peace, especially among the Rulers of our Republic."

Sometimes peace prophets saw clearly, sometimes they did not. Worcester was often wrong; but he was astonishingly right when he said, just forty-four years before the great upheaval:

> Probably it will not be fifty years, perhaps not ten, before there will be a convulsion in the United States, and one part of the citizens armed against the other for mutual havoc and destruction.

In 1833 Thomas S. Grimké—scion of the state which set the flame to the powder at Fort Sumter—had written to William Ladd that

> we may both live twenty years longer, and if we should, I feel assured, that we shall behold a wonderful change, under the blessing of God. I do not despair of seeing by that time, five hundred Peace Societies, and 250,000 members; and 1000 Christian ministers the open advocates of peace on the pure and simple Christian principle.[14]

But Grimké lived only one of those twenty years, and in thirty years a ghastly war was on in earnest, a war which a

stultified peace movement, as a whole, had done nothing to prevent. Prevent? Worse than that, the peace leaders of the country declared a moratorium on their debt to principle, and helped to lead the people to the slaughter. South and North, the performance was all but identical. Their support of the war made unmistakable, Mars, god of fear and fury, put another notch in the stock of his long rifle.

The War Comes to the Peace Movement

The abolitionists had carried on a campaign which will deservedly live forever, even though modern social historians tend to discount its influence. I would not detract from the honor due these splendid agitators. But to their crusading zeal they sometimes added an excessive fury which made them purblind. Garrison's burning of the Constitution at Framingham, Massachusetts, as "a covenant with death and an agreement with hell," would have been one thing had it merely signified a willingness to allow self-determination; but it smacked of a fallacious assumption of innocence in the North and consequently, of all vileness in the South. Thus its net effect was to breed the war spirit which Garrison, when he thought about it, stoutly decried. Sumner declared that he could see little choice "between a war for the Union, which was not to be thought of," and "corrupt conspiracy to preserve it." [15] The *Ashtabula Sentinel,* organ of Giddings in Ohio, and the *New York Tribune,* mouthpiece of Greeley, agreed in allowing the South the right of peaceable secession.

But Lincoln disagreed. Taking a stand diametrically opposed to that principle of self-determinationism enunciated by Woodrow Wilson in 1917, and for which American blood was shed in the World War, The Railsplitter in his inaugural address held that the Union was prior to the Constitution and was inviolable.

Lincoln was an idealist, but with an admixture, always, of the practical politician. He was not one of the abolitionists and did not give them his ear. The platform on which he had been elected upheld "the right of each State to order and con-

trol its own domestic institutions"; in the thirtieth Congress he had given it as his opinion that "any people that can may revolutionize and make their own of so much of the territory as they inhabit." He believed in strict enforcement of the Fugitive Slave Act. He was against slavery, but could see no remedy. His famous Emancipation Proclamation set free only the slaves of the Confederate States and was largely a military measure to throw fear of a Negro insurrection into the hearts of the harassed enemy. Even then Lincoln was not averse to the idea of colonizing free Negroes, with their consent, somewhere "on this Continent or elsewhere" as a solution of the race question.

He was not deaf to the voices of "practical" leaders. Senator Chandler of Michigan felt that the Union would not be "worth a rush without a little bloodletting"; Montgomery Blair, later Lincoln's choice for Postmaster General, expressed the "deliberate opinion that nothing will do so much to secure real and permanent fraternity between the Sections as a decisive defeat" through war.[16]

A combination of crises, culminating in Lincoln's assertive and unwisely handled relief of the garrison at Sumter and the hot-headed elder statesmen of the already-seceded South Carolina, forced a war decision which could have been avoided only by better statesmanship than was available through our political system.

Immediately began the hue and cry for unity. Fernando Wood, long a marked friend of the South, called on "every man, whatever had been his sympathies, to make one great phalanx in this controversy, to proceed . . . to conquer a peace."[17]

The peace forces had almost solidly backed Lincoln in his candidacy. His election in 1860, "if it can be interpreted to prove anything, revealed the will of the nation as in favor of peace."[18] In 1917, when the man who had been elected because "he kept us out of war" carried the country into a conflict, his previous peace attitude made opposition to him harder. It was the same in 1861.

Both men, elected in November, led the nation to war in the following April; both men, before the war had been on very long, began a stern suppression of dissent; both men, by the middle of summer, saw practically all the peace societies mobilized to aid in the prosecution of the war.

In Maryland, where "copperheads" were feared most of all, Frank Key Howard, grandson of Francis Scott Key, was in prison in Fort McHenry on the very date when, forty-seven years before, the flag flying over the fort was written down as the Star Spangled Banner. Ruthless suppression of all who talked against the war was carried out, principally due to Lincoln's personal insistence. To be sure, there was a belief, even among his supporters, that Lincoln was more high-handed than necessary: Wendell Phillips called him "a more unlimited despot than the world knows this side of China." Sumner declared that Lincoln's reënforcement of Fort Sumter and his call for seventy-five thousand men without the consent of Congress, was "the greatest breach ever made in the Constitution, and would hereafter give the President the liberty to declare war whenever he wished without the consent of Congress."

But nevertheless where the war itself was concerned, all the peace groups, with a few exceptions, found that loyalty was the best policy. The cry of "rebellion!" gave them an excuse to call it something other than a war. They overlooked the fact that a rebellious confederacy against Britain was adored as a veritable ark of the covenant; and cried down the new rebellion and confederacy as intolerable, unconstitutional, and base—utterly apart from the slavery issue. Notwithstanding all definitions in international law, a successful revolt is always a Revolution; an unsuccessful one is always a Rebellion. Violence is not a breeder of rationality!

On the Sunday after the fall of Sumter, according to Mary A. Livermore:

> The pulpits thundered with denunciations of the rebellion. Congregations applauded sermons such as were never before heard in Boston, not even from radical preachers. . . . Some of the ministers counselled war rather than longer submission to the

imperious South. . . . The same vigorous speech was heard on the streets, through which surged hosts of excited men. There was an end of patience and in its stead was aroused a determination to avenge the insult offered the nation. Conservative and peaceful counsel was shrivelled in a blaze of belligerent excitement.[19]

In Faneuil Hall there was a huge meeting, where "men, women and children seethed in a fervid excitement." Up the flagstaff ran "that lovely messenger of death," as a poet called it,[20] while

Old men, with white hair and tearful faces, lifted their hats to the national ensign, and reverently saluted it. Young men greeted it with fierce and wild hurrahs, talking the while in terse Saxon of the traitors of the Confederate States [even more Saxon] who had dragged in the dirt this flag of their country, never before dishonored.

Excitement in plenty! Was there any conception of what the war would mean? When the United States went into the World War in 1917, there was a widespread belief that the war would soon be over—in six months, said spokesmen, sometimes, sent among the colleges. And now

there was a general feeling that the rebellion would be suppressed speedily, and that the determined attitude of the North would end very shortly the hostile bluster of the South.

"Whatever it may cost," an orator declaimed, "the Stars and Stripes must wave!" Wave it did, from the steeple of Grace Church in New York to the farthest public and religious buildings in little hamlets. And cost it did, for the price of bunting soared sevenfold and book muslin, used for stars, went from ten cents to three dollars a yard.

Here and there down South the old national airs were deleted from songbooks. Ladies' societies worked on the palmetto and pelican flags, or on the Stars and Bars; while at Memphis and Savannah, to the tune of the Dead March, the former Union banner was buried with pomp and ritual.

Mrs. Livermore reports that in Auburn, New York, where

on the following Sunday she had stopped over on a trip to Chicago:

A newly recruited company of volunteers were to leave on Monday morning for New York, and they were honored with a public leave-taking in one of the churches that evening. The spacious church was crowded to suffocation,—as large an audience waiting outside as was packed within. The pulpit was decked with the national colors. . . . The sermon stirred the pulses like the blast of a bugle. . . . The choir sang patriotic odes, the audience joining with one voice in the exultant refrain, "It is sweet, it is sweet, for one's country to die!" . . . So intense was the feeling that when an appeal was made from the pulpit—transformed by the excitement into a recruiting office—for volunteers to defend the country [by going into the South to enforce Union], some half dozen rose, who were afterwards mustered into the service.

In Chicago, New York—everywhere—mass meetings went through the same reaction. Schoolhouses became centers of war propaganda, churches the centers of campaigns for morale, business concerns the centers of sacrifice only excelled by mounting profits.

In *The Rise of American Civilization,* Charles A. and Mary R. Beard do not overlook the fact that

The armed combat which called forth so much heroism and sacrifice was accompanied by all those darker manifestations of the human spirit that always mark great wars: corruption in high places, cold and cynical profiteering, extravagance and heartless frivolity. . . . Troubles of the same nature plagued the South. . . .

Luxurious living and profiteering on the part of civilians as well as official transgressions characterized the struggle. The new rich could not restrain their emotions. "We are clothed in purple and fine linen," exclaimed the Chicago Tribune, "wear the richest laces and jewels and fare sumptuously every day." When Secretary Chase visited New York on urgent treasury business in the spring of 1864, he found men of affairs more interested in the stock market than in the awful news of bloodshed at the battle front. Running through the letters and papers of the time was the continuous dirge that contractors and profiteers were hoping for a long war and still better "pickings."

The war, of course, was not without its atrocities, genuine and fancied. The massacre at Fort Pillow, where infuriated Southern troops disregarded a flag of truce and cleaned out the garrison of colored forces and white cavalry, had its match in the iniquities of Sheridan's troops in Shenandoah Valley and Sherman's atrocity-littered march to the sea. The cruelties of Libby Prison and especially of Andersonville were indescribable; but the North refused to exchange the prisoners and even went so far as to make medicine contraband.

All the usual war tales were current on both sides. Outrage of women, desecration of graveyards, destruction of fruit trees, defiling of homes and public buildings—all these charges were hurled against both Blue and Gray. "Look at the horde of ruffians and blackguards and cutthroats," exclaimed one Southern paper, "and say what jail or penitentiary has been robbed to bring together these hireling assassins." Lincoln, whose faults left him still a character not without marked nobility, was called "the Baboon President," "a low-bred obscene clown," and "this compound of brute and buffoon." [21]

The same charges were bandied about by papers of the North. Said a writer in *Harper's Weekly:*

> The cruel and incredible barbarities, treacheries and crimes of the rebels every day accumulate in horror. . . . They cut off the heads of our dead at Manassas; they boiled the bodies to get the bones more readily; they buried our brave brothers with their faces down; they swung their heads as trophies upon their homeward march through East Tennessee; they drew Kenly and his heroic troop of Marylanders with a white flag, then unrolled the black and massacred them; they bayonetted the wounded in the Virginia valley; they blew their heads off with the muzzles of their guns held close; they hung old men and young men in Tennessee guilty of loving their country, making the father sit beneath the gallows while they strangled his son, and then with jeers and oaths hung the father beside him; they suspended corpses on trees by railroad tracks and slowed the trains as they passed, while women waved handkerchiefs from the windows of the cars; they shot into our ambulances carrying the wounded and dying; women from the Winchester windows fired pistols at our retreating troops; they poisoned wells and lakes; they planted torpedoes at

Yorktown and Hilton Head to blow up our soldiers. This is the spirit of secession—"a spirit of murder, of assassination, of hell," said Parson Brownlow, and he told the truth.

But the grim and cruel aspects of the war did not cool the ardor of the peace groups which had consented to back it. Even the Draft Act found no conspicuous resistance from the erstwhile "advocates of peace," but was left to undisciplined and unsocial mobs.[22] They did not all go so far as one, who felt that "a rebel has no right except the right of six feet of earth with a bullet in his heart"; but they went farther than they expected when they began to justify the method of war.

The Peace Movement Comes to the War

Silently, one by one, in the infinite meadows of hell, leaders of the country's thought fed their souls on biased news and their own emotionalism. Noisily, one after another, they did their various bits to aid morale.

Edward Everett Hale, though not yet an active peace worker and far from a pacifist, had already begun to comprehend something of the peace cause. But now his talents were devoted to the production of *The Man without a Country*. As he said in a prefatory note to a reprinting of it in 1886:

> This story was written in the summer of 1863, as a contribution, however humble, towards the formation of a just and true national sentiment, a sentiment of love to the nation. It was at the time that Mr. Vallandigham had been sent across the border.[23]

The Boys of 'Sixty-one, according to the memorable ballad, were "tenting to-night on the old camp ground," and begging:

> Give us a song to cheer
> Our weary hearts, a song of home
> And friends we love so dear.

But the songs turned out by the poets were intended to cheer them on to victory; the verses of the period could be characterized as Stephen Tilden of Connecticut did his which were brought out during the French and Indian Wars: *Poems on*

Divers Occasions, Chiefly to Animate and Rouse the Soldiers. And, of course, the populace at home. Many hundreds of poems in this vein were written. Lowell, who had said less than twenty years before

> Ez fer war, I call it murder,—
> There you hev it plain an' flat;
> I don't want to go no furder
> Then my Testyment fer that.

now broke into verse of a different character:

> 'Twunt do to think thet killin' ain't perlite,—
> You've gut to be in airnest, if you fight;
> Why, two-thirds o' the Rebbles 'ould cut dirt,
> Ef they once thought thet Guv'ment meant to hurt;
> An' I *du* wish our Gin'rals hed in mind
> The folks in front more than the folks behind;
> You wunt do much ontil you think it's God,
> An' not constitooents, thet holds the rod.

Emerson's *Essay on War* was already something of a classic; in that outspoken utterance he had denounced the ancient evil as "an epidemic insanity," and asserted that "the sympathy with war is a juvenile and temporary state." He had said before the American Peace Society in 1838:

> If you have a nation of men who have risen to that height of moral cultivation that they will not declare war or carry arms, for they have not so much madness left in their brains, you have a nation of lovers, of benefactors, of true, great and able men. Let me know more of that nation; I shall not find them defenseless, with idle hands swinging at their sides. I shall find them men of love, honor and truth; men of an immense industry; men whose influence is felt to the end of the earth; men whose very look and voice carry the sentence of honor and shame; and all forces yield to their energy and persuasion.

Now, however, he set himself to the task of applying philosophy to morale—so much so that Lowell said of him, later: "To him, more than to all other causes did the young martyrs of our Civil War owe the sustaining strength of thoughtful heroism that is so touching in every record of their lives." [24]

And Whittier too, who "hated war, but . . . hated slavery still more." [25] The man who wrote "The Angels of Buena Vista" and later was to write strongly against war when the French and Germans came together in 1870, now wrote such a poem as his "Voice of the North" (removed from his "complete" editions), in which he said:

Oh! for God and duty stand,
Heart to heart and hand to hand,
Round the old graves of the land.

Whoso shrinks or falters now,
Whoso to the yoke would bow,
Brand the craven on his brow.

Freedom's soil has only place
For a free and fearless race—
None for traitors false and base.[26]

Whittier also wrote his celebrated poem, "Barbara Frietchie," neglecting to consider that if she had been a Southern sympathizer in New Orleans, under General Butler's occupation, by Butler's published orders she would have been arrested as a prostitute:

It is ordered hereafter, when any female shall by mere gesture or movement insult, or show contempt for any officers or soldiers of the United States, she shall be regarded and held liable to be treated as a woman about town plying her vocation.[27]

But war must be romanticized! In his old age Whittier repented somewhat. "If I could have foreseen," said he, "the dreadful bloodshed which resulted from the great conflict, I should have hesitated and restrained my ardor for a more peaceful solution of the great problem." [28]

I am making no effort to supply notes for the biographers whose chief appeal is their exposure of weak spots in their subjects; but there seems almost to have been a conspiracy to keep the record of these Americans as saintlike as possible, and in Thomas Wentworth Higginson's life of Whittier, for example, the whole Civil War period is omitted!

Julia Ward Howe was to lead a peace crusade in a dozen years and in 1899 write a peace poem:

Bid the din of battle cease!
Folded be the wings of fire!
Let your courage conquer peace—
Every gentle heart's desire.[29]

But this gentle heart was stirred in the War of Secession to a more premature view. After a visit to the camps near Washington in 1861, she wrote her famous "Battle Hymn of the Republic":

In the beauty of the lilies Christ was born, across the sea,
With a glory in His bosom that transfigures you and me.
As he died to make men holy, let us die to make men free
While God is marching on.

William Cullen Bryant gave advice:

Lay down the axe, fling by the spade;
Leave in its track the toiling plough;
The rifle and the bayonet-blade
For arms like yours were fitter now.[30]

Oliver Wendell Holmes added his voice:

Listen, young heroes! your country is calling!
Time strikes the hour for the brave and the true![31]

Longfellow, who in "The Arsenal at Springfield" had inveighed against war, now wrote a poem on the sinking of the *Cumberland* by the Confederates' iron ship, the *Merrimac,* justly paying a tribute to the heroism of the lost ship's crew, and ending, in fatuous optimism concerning the results of victory:

Ho! brave land! with hearts like these,
Thy flag, that is rent in twain,
Shall be one again,
And without a seam![32]

In the South, James R. Randall wrote the renowned "My Maryland," with its references to "the Vandal" and "the North-

ern scum"; and Albert Pike wrote the original words of "Dixie," with its defiance of "the spoilers," "the accursed alliance," and "these beagles."

In the North, again, Bayard Taylor was rhyming against "bucklered perfidy" and assuring the bluecoats that "God fights with ye"; Theodore Tilton urged God to smite:

Slay Thou our foes, or turn them to derision!

But down South, Henry Timrod in his poem "Carolina," told his compatriots to

Fling down thy gauntlet to the Huns.[33]

And on behalf of the "Huns," Bret Harte and Joaquin Miller celebrated what Edmund Clarence Stedman called "the Holy War." Walt Whitman, stalwart of stalwarts, chimed in with the rest, but went to the front in "sanitary" and bequeathed some poems about Lincoln that are among the most powerful and lovely in our literature.

Mary Ashley Townsend in the Southland and Longfellow in the North each wrote touchingly of different unknown soldiers.[34]

But the poets were only putting in their lines the rhythm of the nation. Garrison was little different from the rest. He had seen that the war might last a long time, longer than most people thought; and out of it expected the end of slavery. He had not chosen this mode of settlement; but he did not oppose it when it was selected.

He was always a mixture. He, the non-resistant, had once written a twenty-four-page pamphlet, to aid his colored brethren, on *The Loyalty and Devotion of Colored Americans in the Revolution and the War of 1812.* When the war was under way, he hastened to write to his close friend, Oliver Johnson:

Now that civil war has begun and a whirlwind of violence and excitement is to sweep through the country every day increasing in intensity until its bloodiest culmination, it is for the abolitionists to "stand still, and see the salvation of God," rather than to attempt to add anything to the general commotion. It is no time

for minute criticism of Lincoln, Republicanism, or even the other parties now that they are fusing for a death grapple with the Southern slave oligarchy; for they are instruments in the hand of God to carry forward and help achieve the great object of emancipation for which we have so long been striving. The war is fearfully to scourge the nation, but mercy will be mingled with judgment, and grand results are to follow, should no dividing root of bitterness rise up at the North. All our sympathies and wishes must be with the Government, as against the Southern desperadoes and buccaneers; yet of course without any compromise of principle [sic] on our part. We need great circumspection and consummate wisdom in regard to what we say and do, under these unparalleled circumstances. We are rather, for the time being, to note the events transpiring, than seek to control them. There must be no needless turning of popular violence upon ourselves by any false step of our own.[35]

Or any true step, either! Compare this performance with the clear-eyed, kindly, but uncompromising attitude of a Eugene Debs! By invitation Garrison attended the celebration at Fort Sumter, after the war, on the fourth anniversary of its surrender. The invitation was received while he was speaking at Chelsea, Massachusetts, on a platform decorated with a Confederate flag which had been captured by the regiment in which his son, George Thompson Garrison, served as a captain. At Sumter he received the praises of army dignitaries, among them General Anderson, who seemed "quite religious in his spirit, and reverently recognizes the hand of God in all the wonderful events which have taken place." Garrison spoke at the banquet on that occasion, and evoked the plaudits of the conquering military leaders.

Another who turned to the war was Samuel J. May, who had taken the same course as he had advised in 1850 at the time of the fugitive slave law:

> If you know of no better way . . . than by force and arms, then you are bound to use force and arms. . . .[36]

Sumner, who had become the mouthpiece of abolition at Washington, fell into line and turned his oratory against the backward, against England, and bitterly, against the secession-

ists. The beating he had received in the Senate chamber, resulting in three years of incapacity, hardly helped to keep him cool. But it is a curious fact that even after the war was over, Sumner frothed at the mouth every time he thought of anything British; and the "statesman of peace," as chairman of the Senate's Foreign Affairs Committee, lost no chance to stir up a hatred which was at times not far from war. In fact, this champion of arbitration made the most extravagant claims against England over the *Alabama* case, even yelling for damages of $2,125,000,000; and it was only by getting him set aside that Grant—the warrior—succeeded in effecting a victorious but pacific settlement, *by* arbitration, amounting to $15,500,000.

Even Henry C. Wright, representing the very quintessence of non-resistance, succumbed to the pressure of the hour and more or less openly lent his support to the war program.

Andrew Preston Peabody, who in 1843 had said that "war and Christianity belong at opposite poles of the moral firmament," came to "believe that a war may be inevitable, and when it is so, those who are forced into it (he meant himself, as well as others) are blameless." [37]

Most of the Quakers held firmly to their "peace testimony." In the Confederate States only a few "fell by the wayside," even though there was plenty of persecution. In the North, however, there were serious defections. Philadelphia Quakers could in some instances hardly resist the flattery of having, just outside the city, Camp William Penn! "We Are Coming, Father Abraham," the war song, was the work of a Quaker; a Friend, Colonel Palmer, led the Fifteenth Pennsylvania Regiment. Not only in respect to war funds and war supplies were Quakers of aid; there were numerous "fighting Quakers." In Indiana, five Monthly Meetings reported that over a hundred members had enlisted as early as 1862, and the remaining ten Monthly Meetings each reported the enlistment of "a considerable number." [38] "Thee go fight, I will pay thee," so said many of the Friends.

Yet without question, most of the Quakers stood by their

principles, and the denomination *officially* condemned support of war. Dismissals, however, for war service were by no means common.

After all, there was something touching and symbolic of defeat and victory combined, in the funeral service for the brothers Ketcham, two young "fighting Quakers" of New York. As the story of their life and death expresses it—giving illumination on typical attitudes:

> It is a strange sight, the coffin of a soldier, wrapped in a battle-flag, lying in a Friends' meeting-house. He was educated a Friend, and was, in spirit, to the end, one of that peaceful brotherhood, who abhor violence, and blood-shedding, and war. Comfort yourselves, oh Friends! with the thought that he preserved that pious abhorrence as assuredly as you do.[39]

Do not these words of the funeral sermon sound familiar, as one harks back to 1918?

> He was a lover of peace; he went out in the holy cause of peace, as a peacemaker. Not to make war or to continue war, but to put an end to war; to die himself, if need were, by the hand of war, that war might cease.

Thus thought many peace lovers, in that strange state of self-hypnotism which war induces! And among these were the solons of the American Peace Society.

It is neither fair nor accurate to underestimate the pressure put upon them, both from without and within. One and all, the peace forces hated slavery; and always in the back of their minds lurked a hope that the war might result in freedom—a real freedom—for the oppressed people. They had come to look upon the South, where in actuality conditions were bad enough, as the abode of demons, a kind of inferno. Not without some reason they feared the South's new self-assurance. They had too long fed on righteous indignation to realize that even in Dixie there was no complete solidarity (until the war) and they simply could not exercise the slightest discrimination. Nor could they grasp the economic forces subtly working to eliminate slavery as inexorably as Fate.

Even so, they were strangely uninventive, as the record shows.

In the Park Street Church, Boston, on May 27, 1861, occurred the American Peace Society's annual meeting. Burritt, like Blanchard, could never long hold a grudge, and these two, together with other radicals, had been working with the Society in a certain harmony, akin to a truce, for several years. The usual majority of conservatives came out; but in deference to Burritt's eminence and undeniable accomplishments, he was given a place on the program.

Here is what George C. Beckwith had written in *The Advocate of Peace* just prior to the war:

> Why should we resort to brutality and blood, forbidden alike by Christianity and common sense? Why attempt to *force a union,* and thus withdrawing the noble lesson we have been holding forth, make ourselves both abhorrent and ridiculous? [40]

When the war came, the conservatives elected to make themselves "abhorrent and ridiculous," exactly in that way! "Several hours were spent"—at the annual meeting—"in an able and very animated discussion, in which Honorable Amasa Walker, Elihu Burritt, Esq., E. S. Gannett, D.D., Lewis Tappan, Esq., I. T. Hutchins, Esq., Reverend L. H. Angier, Elnathan Davis, and M. G. Thomas, took a part. A house unexpectedly full listened with unwonted interest to the speeches. . . ."

Walker's address is a curious mixture of justification for the Society's attitude and of his own view, which was different. It had to do with "common sense," and reiterated the object of the organization to do away with *war between nations;* but "a peace man I have lived," said he, "and a peace man I hope to die." It is not hard to find the source of Amasa Walker's hesitancy. A pacifist himself, his Uncle-Sam-like features had twisted many a time in mental agony over his two sons, who had gone conscientiously to the duty of killing.

"We," said Burritt, "have come to our trial hour."

> Who shall be able to stand? Thousands in our country have felt and acted with us, to a certain degree of interest and activity,

when the skies were fair and tranquil over our own land, and when the great evil of war seemed a distant and foreign eventuality. But now our turn has come, with a pressure of trial which our friends abroad never experienced. . . . He who ventures to enter his protest against this awful conflict, now about to engulf our country in the carnage and desolation of a civil war, becomes instantly subject to the charge, if not the punishment, of treason. He finds the enemy and avenger of his sentiments in his own house, or his neighbor's house. His own familiar friend, with whom he took sweet counsel, and walked to the house of God in company, rises against him, as a member of the great government of the people, and taunts him with treason in its authority.

What then?

Until those who profess to be actuated by the spirit, and live by the rule of Christian faith, shall be enlightened to see that it excludes them from all participation in war, we shall see, when the trial comes, just such a scene as the country now presents. . . . Now, many persons misapprehend our position entirely. They frequently ask, in a kind of triumphant tone, what would you do in such and such a case, when two nations, aroused to the highest pitch of the war-fever, are clutching at each other's throats? As well might you ask a physician what he would do when he is first called in to a patient nine days gone with the most malignant fever, which has been set on fire by poisonous liquor, until the pulse is at the rate of 200 a minute. If he can do nothing for the recovery of such a person, does it tell against his professional ability? Whatever he might attempt to do in such a case, it is certain that he would say: "It is too late; you should have called me in sooner. . . ."

As the North is so deeply implicated in the planting of slavery on this continent, it would have been an act of moral duty on its part, as well as enlightened policy, to have come forward, and made a generous and magnanimous overture to the Southern States, to compensate them honorably, from the national treasury, for the emancipation of their slaves. If this offer had been made five or ten years ago, I am confident that we should never have come to the present crisis and complexion of affairs.[41]

Lewis Tappan, in great puzzlement and torn by conflicting desires, announced his support of the war. There was scant evasion of issues in his address; it portrays a man honestly trying to see all sides of a vexing situation and making a choice

in accord with his conscience. He was representative of many, in the peace movement, doubtless—unimaginative, unsteeled to resist propaganda, unselfish, unable to appear uncoöperative in what seemed on the face of it a noble crusade.

The others followed suit; and soon Gerritt Smith, chief backer of Burritt's war-preventive enterprise, also made public a letter explaining his intent to join the war effort.

There were those, as in every war, however, who left no argument unexploited, by whatever casuistry they advanced it.

General Sherman, in the fashion of the military-minded in every generation since Cain "arrested" Abel, hailed the armies —the Northern armies—as police. And George Beckwith (forgetting his justification of revolution in Europe) now chimed in, "Thus reasons an intelligent warrior, and . . . we do not object."

Burritt, however, had seen more clearly, long before:

> There is a broad, deep, dark river without a bridge between the policeman and the soldier, between all the agencies and enginery of war and those of civil government.[42]

But Beckwith asserted, "The cause of Peace was never meant to meet such a crisis as is now upon us." [43]

When a meeting of pacifists met in New York and voiced their opposition to the war, none of the metropolitan newspapers dealt with it so harshly as Beckwith in *The Advocate.*

A prize of five hundred dollars was offered by one Society member for a "review of the war" similar to the one by A. A. Livermore on the War with Mexico, providing another five hundred should be added to it. But there was little desire to have a probing mind perform any surgery on the case presented for the peace movement in this war, and the offer was not taken up.

The core of the war-backers' views was expressed by Beckwith in *The Advocate of Peace* for May-June, 1861:

> We trust our friends will, first of all, bear ever in mind that *Peace is always loyal.* It is not possible for a Peace man to be a rebel.

Harder than for a camel to slide through a needle's eye, apparently—and yet it has been done! And would Beckwith and his gentry have confessed to a belief that the loyalists of the American Revolution were the true peace men?

But all responsibility was passed on:

> All that can be required of us, is that we prove ourselves loyal citizens. The issue belongs not to peace men, but to rulers, as a question of authority, right and power. It is not strictly war. . . .

Ask the man that fights one. A soldier on the field of battle would probably have been ready to concede a certain similarity. But the peace movement was not in the fighting; it was neither above nor against the battle. As a matter of fact, it was little or nothing but an echo of the popular clamor—as showed by a revealing "only":

> *The Advocate* only expresses the opinions of all law-abiding citizens in every part of the nation.

But there were a few who had opinions of their own.

The Faithful

Most of the faithful were Quakers, heavy as the losses were from their ranks in the urban centers. In a later place some of their unflinching ones will be described.

Elihu Burritt stood firm from start to finish. Working the land on his New Britain farm, he kept up his editorial labors and, though temperate, unmistakably expressed his non-support of the war.

Joshua Blanchard was conspicuously another. How he escaped jail, in spite of his advanced age, is a mystery; for though he was not influential in any practical degree, he succeeded in obtaining publication, in daily and weekly and monthly religious and secular papers, of the most outspoken sentiments.

Blanchard, like Burritt, seems almost a legendary figure. Few men possess the ability to grow more radical and bold with the passage of time. To see this benign, clear-eyed old gentle-

man in his formal high collar—hidden in front by a cascade of snowy whiskers—who would guess the timber he was made of? But after all, there was a touch about his bush of hair not unlike that of the late Senator LaFollette; there was the disregard of convention hinted by the hands stuck easily into trousers pockets, even in a studio photograph; there was the alert erectness none too often associated with patriarchal benevolence.

His manuscripts marked "unpublished" are numerous; yet the clippings far outweigh them. Not only war, but a host of social evils came in for this man's treatment. Education, in particular, was a hobby; he had served on Boston's Primary School Board.

Here is almost his first printed comment on the war:

> In the recent martial movements for hostilities against the South, we have witnessed one of the most surprising commotions and seeming changes of popular sentiment and action ever known in the world. It is not that a revolutionary spirit, long cherished by an oppressed people, has been suddenly developed, and deliverance attempted by a bloody conflict; it is not that a reigning government has called forth its armies to suppress armed insurrection, or to subdue or annex a province that they claim; it is not the alarmed agitation of a community, menaced with invasion, for the safety of their rights and their homes; it is not the throes of the spirit of patriotism and pride, to avenge insulted national honor, or redress injured interest: for all these transactions are frequent in the past, and form, indeed, a great part of the records of history. But we see the people of a vast union of States, reputed spirited and intelligent, long cold and insensible to wrongs and injuries of the most ferocious nature, or only manifesting spasmodic excitements, constantly and rapidly subsiding, and even supporting a corrupt rule over them which they detested; ever refusing to take the most legitimate and righteous means for redress, when those means were most placed in their power,—suddenly roused by a single unimportant transaction into an all-pervading martial ardor, intent on crushing all the evils they feel or fear, by all the tyranny and bloodshed of war, in defiance of the dictates of reason and justice, and the most explicit precepts of Christianity. And, what is yet more wonderful, this course is not only pursued by the ignorant and the depraved, but advocated by ministers of the gospel, the most humane and pious of

others, and even by those most noted for their advocacy of peace."

Access to *The Advocate of Peace* being out of the question for the expression of anti-war views, Blanchard had to depend chiefly on Garrison's *Liberator,* and Burritt's *Bond of Brotherhood,* now issued only abroad. In *The Liberator,* more than four months after warfare had been opened, he exposed the sophistry of the American Peace Society:

It is true that the Society has always disclaimed any interference with the action of Government on its own citizens; but it is not true that its action was intended to be confined to wars between foreign independent nations. The 2nd Article of its Constitution, defining its objects, says, "This Society, being founded on the principle that *all* war is contrary to the spirit of the Gospel, shall have for its object to illustrate the inconsistency of war with Christianity, to show its baleful influence on all the great interests of mankind, and to devise means for insuring universal and permanent peace;" and this is the basis on which the Society still avowedly and distinctly stands.

Now, "all war" includes civil war as well as foreign war; and, most certainly, civil war is as inconsistent as foreign with Christianity, and exerts as baleful an influence. The question for the Society, therefore, is, not whether the conflict with the so-called Southern Confederacy is, or is not, with a foreign or independent nation, but only whether it is war; and the pretence for disregarding it as foreign to the Society's object is taken away, as here there is no mutually authorized arbiter to determine between the parties, any more than in a foreign war.

Although the Society is ostensibly pledged to oppose *all war,* it is well known that many of its members—perhaps a majority—do not disapprove of any war which they call defensive, although what constitutes this character is not yet defined; and as most wars are termed defensive on both sides, by the nations who wage them, and it is not probable that our Government will ever declare a war avowedly aggressive on its part, it then follows that all civil wars are to be deemed only rebellions which a Government may rightfully put down. Both these classes, then, being out of the cognizance of the Peace Society, it cannot be discerned what wars are left, to which it can apply its scrupulous remonstrance.

And then—tart but hardly unjustified:

Its officers may hereafter safely pocket the contributions of its members and friends, without the obligation of affording a hope that they will ever be effectively used for the extension of the principles of peace.[45]

Blanchard was a veritable bloodhound in those days, and rare indeed was the backslider he failed to track down. But there was no vicious malice in his soul; only a determination that there should be no befogging of the issue.

He entered the meetings of the American Peace Society and for the benefit of the public that was reachable, he punctured the balloons of silence which floated about in the form of official reports and which yet told nothing. Of the American Peace Society's meeting in 1864 he did not neglect to publish that only a dozen or so were present—something one would never guess from *The Advocate of Peace*. In *The Christian Register* he described the resolution he sought to have the meeting pass, expressing disapproval of the war, and made clear the manner of its rejection.

In the Boston *Courier,* right in the middle of the war, he published a letter giving the text of two declarations which had been prepared to afford a sort of associate membership in the League of Universal Brotherhood, slightly less drastic than the central and original pledge. He appended the list of signers, and stated that "these documents are probably forgotten by those whose names are signed as above, and a printed copy is now sent to each of the survivors of them, not only to refresh their memories, but to afford a subject to their consideration, whether they were in error when they signed them, or whether they still retain the sentiments expressed, but do not perceive them to be applicable to the present war, and for what reason. The original of the declaration, in manuscript, with the autograph signatures, are in my possession."[46]

The list discloses that only Blanchard himself—who had hesitated, a dozen years or so before, to sign Burritt's radical statement!—George Merrill, and S. E. Sewall retained "the sentiments expressed, and applied them to the present war."

On the other side were lined up seventy-six erstwhile celeb-

rities of the peace movement. Among them stood out such names as those of Samuel J. May, Charles Sumner, Walter Channing, Samuel Gridley Howe, Elizur Wright, Charles Spear (foe of capital punishment!) Ezra Stiles Gannett, James Freeman Clarke, E. W. Jackson and Charles Brooks.

At this time (1863) Blanchard was eighty-one years old. But he lived for five years more, and those were active years, filled with high endeavor. There were others like him, though few were as conspicuously defiant.

Guardedly, a few anti-war pamphlets were circulated—one of them the moderate sermon of the Reverend Thomas Williams, of Providence, which has been quoted near the beginning of this book, and which was delivered almost half a century before. Adin Ballou, up in the Hopedale Community, in eastern Massachusetts, issued *Christian Non-Resistance Defended Against Rev. Henry Ward Beecher,* while the whole community put out some vigorous *Declaratory Resolutions with Reference to the Existing Civil War.*

The pacifists and non-resistants, never reconciled to the war, contended from start to finish, and contended for ever after, that the war was not necessary to the abolition of slavery; and that the war method of abolition was prejudicial to real freedom for the Negro.

Denmark had given up its colonial slaves in 1802. Great Britain had abolished slavery in 1833, freeing three-quarters of a million in the West Indies, without war. In 1827 Mexico started a gradual abolition of slavery, without war. In 1848 France abolished slavery, without war. In 1878 Spain abolished slavery in Cuba, without war. In 1888 Brazil abolished slavery, setting 700,000 free, without war. And we must never forget, in the words of the Beards (*Rise of American Civilization*) that

> The physical combat that punctuated the conflict merely hastened the inevitable. As was remarked at the time, the South was fighting against the census returns—census returns that told of accumulating industrial capital, multiplying captains of industry, expanding railway systems, widening acres tilled by free farmers.

And as far as the Negro is concerned, any thoughtful observation at all only confirms the fears of the war-time pacifists. Never, in the face of a defeat-psychosis, could the Fourteenth Amendment be enforced. From the Civil War came a legacy of sectionalism not even yet dissipated. Ernest Howard Crosby tells of going into a Southern community about 1905 and finding evidence of the intellectual folly which a war mentality implants and tenaciously perpetuates; the book of which he writes is on my shelves, and Crosby's comment does scant justice to this masterpiece:

I put up one afternoon for a few hours at a tiny hotel in a remote village, and a room was assigned to me which had been vacated in haste for my benefit by some more permanent resident. It bore all the marks of a sitting-room as well as a bedroom, and on the table were lying, one on the other, a couple of books which had evidently been recently laid aside, and each of them contained a book-mark. The under volume was a large Bagster Bible; the upper was a big book bearing on its upturned cover the exaggerated face of a Negro in gilt, made to look as much like an ape as possible, with the title in gilt letters above and below it, "The Negro a Beast, Or In the Image of God." Two Negro servants were coming in and out of the room, making the fire and preparing for my comfort, and I could not but wonder at the strange lack of delicacy of the Bible reader who had left this hideous volume to stare them in the face, and this, too, in the chivalrous South. I picked up the book in curiosity after the servants had left. The title page was adorned by a series of subtitles, of which I copied one as a sample. It read as follows: "The Negro a Beast, But Created With Articulate Speech and Hands, That He May Be of Service to His Master, the White Man." Here was indeed a rich relic of the ancient South of slavery, a South that has passed away forever! I looked down at the date and rubbed my eyes in astonishment. There must be some mistake. The book was printed in the Year of Our Lord 1900! And in one of the greatest cities of the South, too! And what do you suppose is the name of the publishing company which issues this precious work? It is called the "American Book and Bible House!" [47]

The late popularity of Thomas Dixon and the present vestigial remnants of the Ku Klux Klan, are a testimony to many

evils besides the Civil War. Yet the instances one could cite to show the blighting influence of the conflict on the South are innumerable; and the North of to-day is far from evidencing a uniformly high conception of race relations.

The war is playing its part to-day. In 1924, in Madison Square Garden, I saw a fight threatened instantly by the delegation representing the Empire State of the South when the band of the Democratic National Convention, at a critical juncture, played "Marching through Georgia."

The harm done by that war was to go on poisoning the life of the American people, black and white alike, for generations.

The damage to the peace movement was to be compensated for, in part; since from that gigantic betrayal, a sturdy new group was to emerge, never to be powerful enough to stop a war, but privileged to do incalculable good and to carry on for almost fifty years.

CHAPTER XIX

UPHILL—AND DOWN

If the general impression of the pacifist involves any idea of insincerity, of supine peace-at-any-price, of disloyalty to the government or even lack of support in war, it is a very mistaken impression.—MAJOR SHERMAN MILES, *North American Review,* March, 1923.

CHAPTER XIX

UPHILL—AND DOWN

Out of the Civil War came an eagerness for expansion, a nationalistic gusto, a great wave of military ardor. Heated to so high a temperature, the country could not cool at once. The fascinating possibilities of iron ships engaged the navalists, and the army experts found in the new developments of artillery and strategy an irresistible allure.

Two years after the end of the war, the Alaska Purchase was negotiated; it was most certainly a sound investment, but it gradually supplied an excuse for more warships. A speaker complained to a Boston peace meeting:

> Today the armaments of the Old World are immense. Why do they not disarm? The nations are afraid of each other; and our own Congress is moving into line with them—moving to build navies to take care of the seals up in Behring Straits.[1]

The standing army was speedily absorbed into civil life, but there it wielded a great power. Military schools sprang up like grass after a shower; it was everywhere "Lieutenant This" and "Major That," and around the natural sympathy and pride evoked by men uncomplainingly capable of war's hardships was thrown a glamorous mist which the rush of war fiction only thickened. Such works as *The Boys' Book of Battle Lyrics* contributed their romantic urge to the military spirit. A vast army of veterans, in North and South alike, served as reminders of war heroism which was actually more of an incentive, emotionally, than a deterrent: in Virginia alone, for example, the State roster of Confederate pensioners even as late as 1926 contained over nine thousand names. Across the lands of the West an ebullient sense of strength forced steel rails,

and converted thousands of living redskins into the only kind of Indians white "superiors" thought were good.

Against this sort of lusty frontier extension nothing could prevail; it was a march of economic inevitability. Against its militaristic accompaniments the old-line peace groups were not able even to raise a feeble voice—their words were still, for many years, devoted to elaborate alibis. So bent on vindication was the inwardly perturbed Beckwith that he devoted most of his writing, up to the end of his life five years after the war, to a continuous recital of his war-time justifications. Probably the last tract issued under his hand attributed to Noah Worcester the origin of the American peace movement, carefully omitting any mention of David Dodge, and listed as its leaders only Ladd and eight minor conservatives.

Many were contrite and ill at ease. War increases militarism, inevitably; sometimes it spurs on peace work too. A vigorous peace group was sorely needed; and now it was to come.

A Radical Peace Society

The pacifist radicals were in a rebellious mood. When they sought to build up a new movement, they took pains to point some definite distinctions.

The old organization was the American Peace Society; the new one was called the Universal Peace Society.

The old one had never been other than timid, officially, about the rising woman movement; the new one not only announced its support of the feminist cause but proved its sincerity by appointing women liberally on its committees and to its offices.

The old one had never been eager for actual fellowship with colored Americans; the new one went out of its way to encourage Negro membership.

The temper of the old one was adaptive, imitative, apologetic; the new one was primarily interested in asserting principles it considered vital, let the chips fall where they would. "We were brought to the front by the Civil War," said the new Society's first and only President, looking back in retrospect as a man of eighty-one:

Men of confirmed principles had been drafted, who from conscientious convictions could not enter the army or comply with the provisions of the conscription act.[2]

In 1866, when the Universal Peace Society was organized by meetings at Boston and Providence, Adin Ballou was asked to be President but declined on account of his age; and Alfred H. Love, a young cloth merchant of Philadelphia, was elected.

A call, signed by one hundred and fifty people, had gone out. It said, in part:

> The experiment of 6000 years, to establish peace by deadly force, has failed, and the record is written in blood! . . . Believing that *Legalized Man Killing* is inexpedient, inhuman, unchristian and barbarous, is it not time to try some better plan? And convinced that the causes of War, as well as War itself, must surrender to Justice, Love, and Truth, as the conditions of Radical Peace, we invite to these meetings all persons, irrespective of Sex, Color, Race or Faith.

From the first meeting went out a rather pointed statement, accompanied also by a decision to have future annual meetings on the same hallowed old dates as observed by the American Peace Society—the anniversary of its founding.

> We reverently acknowledge the encouragement given by the good men and women of all time, and the Peace Societies of Great Britain and elsewhere. On this side of the Atlantic we find the American Peace Society, which claims to represent the cause, and is good as far as it goes, but does not go as far as goodness. . . .
>
> We consecrate our cause with . . . love, which aboundeth with peace; though while we shall make no concessions with wrong and no compromises with any war that will impair our faith in pure peace principles, we shall not forget that charity which accepts honest convictions and welcomes the co-operation of everyone animated by sincere religious feeling and faithful integrity. . . .
>
> We are aware that this movement is against the tide of a widely prevalent martial feeling, and scarcely expect candid and impartial consideration; for it is the nature of war to pardon all sins deemed essential to the accomplishment of its aims and purposes.[3]

The new Society's constitution declared:

> Its objects shall be, to remove the causes and abolish the customs of war; to discountenance all resorts to deadly force between individuals, states, or nations,—never acquiescing in present wrongs.

The young President, at the first anniversary Convention in 1867, vowed that

> We shall not fold our arms in despair, nor go to sleep on the sweet word of peace, for it is almost killed with kindness—sermons, editorials, speeches abound with it.

It took the young movement a few years to get its bearings. Within it various conflicting interests and opinions pulled in different directions. The only substantial difference lay in the vexing issue of government. Alfred Love was always a conservative in this realm, and almost, sometimes, an idolater of eminence. But here were also Joshua Blanchard (as treasurer until his old age made him give up the work), who feared not to say what he thought was truth, even about a government in arms; and Henry C. Wright, who thought governments at any time only instruments of evil and oppression.

When Love, in May of 1868, issued a statement printed by the New York *World,* to the effect that the Society was not willing to arraign a war government, "for doing a war act when that act seems to be done on their basis for the best," Ezra Heywood of Worcester wrote to the *World:*

> It is pre-eminently *for* doing this that our association exists. As is well known the American Peace Society and Nonresistants generally were so recreant to their principles in 1861 and thereafter, that the faith delivered to peace saints was kept only by "copperhead" sinners. Opposed to all wars except the present one, at the very time when their ideas were of practical importance, and should have given law and unity to distracted States, in violation of the kindly feeling and mutual interests of the common people North and South, they joined the reprehensible pro-slavery and anti-slavery leaders in merciless advocacy of violence and blood. A few persons, of whom I had the honor to be one, unwilling to follow Garrison and Sumner in their apostasy to the humane spirit and methods which had hitherto directed

the anti-slavery movement, thinking that if war was so good a thing it would bear criticism, and if "loyal" abolitionists could burn the Federal Constitution in their meetings, "secession" Democrats should at least have free speech in discussing it, conferred together, and subsequently organized the Universal Peace Society. . . .

In behalf of several members of the Society and of the Executive Committee, Heywood asked publication for his correction,

in order that the intelligent public may not find us so wanting in courage and faith, as to shun the logical application of our principles to national affairs.[4]

A crisis was averted by the wise constitution, which provided that a minority vote or resolution should always be given equal publicity with that of the majority. Some of the local groups which made up the federation—soon called the Universal Peace Union—split the difference on war service and arranged matters so that "Persons who take part in, or encourage war, shall not be *officers* of this society." A modification of Wright's original attitude was adopted, in 1867, which read:

Resolved, That as advocates of radical peace, we can take no part in creating or administering a government based on military power, neither can we use the ballot, when *in our opinion* it represents a bullet.

From the first the Union opposed capital punishment, and on several occasions its vigorous intervention was largely responsible for commutations of the death sentence.

Lucretia Mott—recently celebrated by admirers only as "abolitionist and pioneer feminist"—attended the meetings when her health permitted, and succeeded her husband James Mott, as President of the Pennsylvania Peace Society, the Union's largest branch. The elderly radical had fed doughnuts to the troops who marched through her yard from William Penn Camp near by, but she had not been among those who backed the war itself. At the age of seventy-three she stood up in one of the Union's meetings and firmly voiced her hope —not to be wholly realized—

War can be made unpopular. Some of the youngest here will live to see war abolished.

Lucy Stone was another who sometimes came, attracted by the evident honesty of Alfred Love's leadership in his frequent appointments of women to more than minor places.

The cause of the American Indians, then far from popular, was taken up and never forgotten by the Union; and the Society was always close to the movement for temperance.

In those days "radical" was a term which commonly meant what its derivation implied, namely, one who wants to get down to the root of a problem, and was not obscured by propagandist misrepresentation. Not only were there radical causes, but the word itself was freely used. Hence there were "radical" societies: the "Massachusetts Radical Peace Society," the "Rhode Island Radical Peace Society," etc. Some of these continued right up to the World War. In the middle of this half-century the famous Radical Club in Boston was functioning, as well as a paper, *The Radical.*

A conservative in temper, methods, judgment, and associations, the Union's President was indeed an extraordinary leader. But he was unwavering, determined, sacrificial, patient, and unconquerable. But for him the peace movement would probably have had no significant radical expression for many years. Only death, after forty-seven years at the same heartbreaking, uphill effort laid down his pen and spared him the travail of the enormous conflict that opened one year after his passing.

Alfred H. Love

Alfred Love was born in Philadelphia on the seventh of September, 1830, a year before the founding of *The Liberator.* He grew up with the anti-slavery movement and was a zealous worker for it. But he could not reconcile himself to violence; though he was not formally registered with the Friends until late in life, he attended meetings of the Society regularly. He was married in 1853 to Susan Brown, of a (Hicksite) Quaker family. Even as a young man he was firmly opposed to

war. He could recognize a difference between the Mexican War and the Civil War; but no difference commensurate with the harm wrought by the latter conflict.

During Lincoln's lifetime Alfred Love interceded with him on behalf of pacifists who would not be drafted. As for himself, he made it clear to one and all that he was willing to be shot, if necessary to prove his sincerity; but that he would shoot nobody. When drafted in July, 1863, he wrote in his journal: "I stand to-day a conscript! But I have a duty to perform upon conscientious grounds. No substitute! No three hundred dollars! No arms for me. I know not the penalties, but will pray and trust for strength to bear it all." Followed a series of inquisitions by unsympathetic and coercive officials. Some of his friends who were not opposed to war offered to take his place in the army, and others volunteered to pay the three hundred dollars for a substitute. Again he writes, "I made no concessions, and will bear the penalty charitably, prayerfully." Finally, however, the authorities, convinced that his will could not be broken, and noting anyway that he was too near-sighted for active service, released him, though he had manifested a willingness to aid the sick no matter in how dangerous a fighting zone.

Apparently he was one of those with whom the government did not desire to force an issue. Lincoln, who had not hesitated to play the rôle of iron tyrant, also could not fail to respect men of unshakable convictions, and to the disgust of many in his counsels showed various groups of Quakers the magnanimity for which he was beloved. And Alfred Love, with his pen and with his personality, was winsome and oftentimes invincible.

No man could remain the chief prop and mainstay of an organization for almost half a century without becoming, in his old age, a bit impatient of new ways and the ideas of others; and he was sometimes criticized on just such grounds. Over the short white beard was a not unkindly but a stubborn mouth. Yet he had a curious faculty of holding his friends to the last moment of his life—friends passionately devoted and loyal.

If he was "very determined" and "not easy to work with," as some have said, one can only, in perspective, summing up his whole career, be thankful rather than otherwise for his strong will, and point to a series of unbroken friendships hard to parallel in any similar circumstances.

Modest he was; often a little shy, far from that spectral type, so dear to the imaginations of reactionaries, of "temperamental radical." As he stood in the Friends' Meeting House at Providence and whimsically reared his thin frame before the gathering that had picked a thirty-six-year-old leader, he said he "supposed they had selected a young man for a long work, but whenever the position became popular, let him vacate and give place to a more prominent person."

His acceptance of that job was going to mean for Alfred Love that instead of riches—which a man of his ability and industry could certainly have accumulated—he should live in modest means all his life, and even so to be a consistent giver to the cause which so engrossed him. Few commission merchants run the risk of neglecting business for so many social enterprises. Love was a vice president of the Pennsylvania Abolition Society, a Patron of the International Council of Women, an official prison visitor for forty-three years, Vice President of the Pennsylvania Prison Society. Every cause, from education to orphan asylums, found in him a ready response.

Geniality, almost without exception a characteristic of those who labor for unpopular movements (common impressions to the contrary notwithstanding) is ascribed to Love by most of those who knew him well. "He was keenly sensitive to wit and humor and could relate an anecdote with delicacy and point that always gave to it the happiest effect." [5]

In his office one prized possession was a picture of Fredrik Bajer, the Danish peace worker, framed by bits of cigar boxes ingeniously glued in a mosaic pattern by an admiring inmate of Eastern Penitentiary. Under the persuasive enthusiasm of a man like Love, convicts—and even police officials!—could work up a warm interest in good will and world peace.

Tenderness—and firmness. The man who leaned over the coffin which held the body of his fellow laborer, Lucretia Mott, and said brokenly, "Lucretia, I claim the right of kissing thee farewell," could also bear without receding an inch from his position the whole flood of denunciation, scorn, and hatred which was let loose upon him during the Spanish-American War.

Alfred Love was not an eloquent writer; nor was he a stirring speaker of the kind that can emotionally excite huge crowds. But what he wrote was clear and compounded of truth and nobility; and those who heard him could not quickly erase his words from their minds.

He wrote never a book; but from his pen came articles, editorials and letters which, if bound in one volume, would make a mammoth tome. *The Bond of Peace, The Voice of Peace, The Prison Journal,* and from 1883 to 1913 *The Peacemaker and Court of Arbitration* were chiefly edited by him. For many years associated with him as Secretary of the Union was the Reverend Amanda Deyo, one of the first women preachers, and Miss Arabella Carter, who since 1900 served devotedly as Business Manager and Secretary, and who is largely responsible for the preservation of such memorabilia as exist concerning the Universal Peace Union and its President.

In 1891 Love was selected as a member of the committee of five to organize the International Peace Bureau. The Bureau was the chief instrument for the management of the international peace congresses. The others with Love were Fredrik Bajer, Hodgson Pratt, Angelo Mazzoleni of Italy and Elie Ducommun of Switzerland. Though mentioned several times as one whose work should be sustained by grants from Carnegie peace funds, he never received any; though mentioned as a fit recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize, it never came to him. He was too radical on peace for such support. Among Friends to-day he is incredibly little known; and the compilers of the great new Dictionary of American Biography at first deemed him of insufficient "distinction"—he who was so dis-

tinct from others!—for inclusion though later, thanks to Professor M. E. Curti, room was made for him.

In his eighty-third year, on June 29, 1913, Alfred Love gave up with the last breath his steadfast labor for his dream. Services in his memory were held in many places, especially in Philadelphia and at Mystic in Connecticut. Six weeks after him his wife died also. The record of his life, said *Unity,*

> is increasingly significant and adds a great touch of prophetic encouragement when we learn that all this while, since 1853, he has been the senior member of the firm of E. H. Love and Co., woolen commission merchants. Here was a business man of sixty years' active experience rendering high service to humanity, not in spite of, but by virtue of, his business career.[6]

And in his relations with employees, be it noted, Love, although never an economic radical, kept the esteem of all, carrying out in his everyday affairs his principles of justice. His bookkeeper, Charles Hastings, was a lifelong friend and served as Treasurer of his humanitarian undertakings.

He was a man of religion, sometimes of a very conservative religious background; but to him his religious views would have had no meaning except as they were carried into the stirring issues of his times. "His heart remained young," an old friend testified, "his mind serene, to the last, and his death was an appropriate and beautiful close to an eminently honored and useful life."

Slow-Moving Years

Far from spectacular for the peace movement, in the main, were the years spanned by the public life of Alfred Love. Increasingly the Universal Peace Union and a somewhat revitalized American Peace Society coöperated. Increasingly work for arbitration came to be the major interest of the whole movement. The events of these fifty years are not so deeply buried in obscurity as earlier events in our study, and we shall do wisely not to spend too much time here on needless details. If there is to be distorted emphasis in this chapter, it will be on behalf of the history that is less well known.

More than forty branch peace societies were technically affiliated with the Universal Peace Union in the course of time. The Union, in common with most of the peace groups, tended to exaggerate, unintentionally, the effects of its work on public opinion and official policy. Discounting for the magnifying glass of enthusiasm, however, there is a record of achievement that more than justifies all the sacrifice exacted. Without the protests aroused by this organization, Indians would have been treated far worse, in many instances, than they were. Laws in Pennsylvania, at least were relaxed in their application to conscientious objectors, and in large measure because of the Union's aggressive agitation. Planks on peace were inserted in the platforms of the parties because the Union, in particular, was on the job. Measures for military training were certain, even when successful, to encounter vigorous opposition centering in the U.P.U. At least one college (Swarthmore) yielded to the Society's arguments and instituted a course in arbitration. The Union fought against executions of murderers, the killing of Indian military leaders when captured, the rigid exclusion of Oriental immigration, the spread of white imperialism in Africa, and retaliatory tariffs. If it did not win its fights, it carried the torch of enlightenment down through decades of valiant struggle.

Its ability to obtain huge crowds at some of its public meetings seems almost marvelous. The ship-building town of Mystic, on the Mystic River in Connecticut, was near to the settlement of Rogerenes, who were a pacifist sect with a picturesque rebellious history. From the Rogerenes still living, and especially the large and active Whipple family of "thirty-one peace workers," every move of the Universal Peace Union had received the warmest backing. Hardly had the organization been conceived when, seated on a great rock by the river, Alfred Love and the pacifists of Mystic made tentative plans for a series of meetings in a near-by grove. "Down by the riverside," they declared, as the Negro spiritual puts it, "we ain' goin' study war no more"—but peace instead.

Hardly sixty persons came at first; but as the years went by,

these huge "peace meetings," as they were called, drew several thousand persons. From far and near they came. One of the earliest memories of this chronicler's boyhood, though nothing is recalled concerning the ceremonies, is driving in through the great gate in a shiny buggy and consuming dangerous quantities of popcorn amid a crowd of people under a cool expanse of forest.

Frequently, in the 'eighties or 'nineties, anywhere from 4,000 to 10,000 people would attend the three days' exercises, to hear the speakers participate in the discussions, listen to the prize speaking contest for children, and hear old John Hutchinson, last of a famous family quintet, singing

> Let us love one another,
> Not long may we stay
> In this bleak world of mourning—
> Some droop while 'tis day.
>
> Let us love one another as long as we stay.

Of John, who in his declining years looked like Santa Claus and was a bit eccentric, the story is told how he acquired a young bride, who in order to make him more attractive put his shoulder-long white hair in curl papers. Embarrassing indeed was it to the leaders of the peace meeting, when he appeared at a celebration of a launching with the curl papers still in!

How extensively the Union had come to be a society of elderly people—with some conspicuous exceptions—is shown by the roster of vice presidents, numbering dozens, and the series of photographs in *The Peacemaker*. The lack of new blood is attributable chiefly, in all probability, to the policy of leaning too heavily on "big names"—the star system of the theater transferred to altruistic enterprise.

In some respects the Union made no headway whatsoever. One of its drives, in 1874, was meant to remove the whipping post from use in Delaware; but the post is still there.

Never did *The Peacemaker* obtain an average paid circulation far above a thousand—not even when offered in club with *Godey's Lady's Book*.

But in the employment of symbolism, the society was unexcelled. It fostered the use of peace flags; it spread through the schools peace badges which had been made from melted cannon. From swords, beginning with one which had been carried in the Mexican War, and which was donated by a Civil War veteran, a model plow was cast and along with it some pruning hooks. Small replicas of William Penn's house, with studiously copied toy furniture, were given to many a kindergarten and primary school. Interesting exhibits were prepared for the World's Fair at Chicago in 1893, and the St. Louis and Jamestown Expositions of 1904 and 1907; these exhibits, and the work of the Union for peace, won high awards.

Allowing for every possible overstatement in the record of the Universal Peace Union by its partisans, still it is preposterous of the present American Peace Society to assert that

> Up to the rumblings of the World War, the peace movement of America was almost exclusively the American Peace Society and its work.[7]

Revolt Against War (in Europe)

No sooner had the pre-war liberals of the North caught breath after their exhortations during the Civil War than the war between France and Germany—which had been prophesied in the annual report of the Universal Peace Union in 1867—gave them a chance to assuage their consciences.

They seized the opportunity, and for several years the land resounded with criticism of *Europe's* barbarous war system. Sumner issued his eloquent address on *The Duel between France and Germany,* and by then had persuaded himself that "peace is our supreme vocation. To this we are called." For saying it the New York *Herald* called him scornfully a dreamer, which, for uttering such a thing in the glare of his own inflammatory record, he certainly was. Even at the time, Sumner, with Thaddeus Stevens, was chiefly responsible for a policy toward the South which kept up the post-war military occupation until 1877, three years after his death.

Beecher complained that

> Today, the supreme business of nations in European Christendom is teaching the whole people how to war.[8]

But in order to demonstrate his own ability as an instructor he himself, earlier in the war across the seas, had laid down an interesting alternative:

> Armies are said to be cruel. Yes, they *are* cruel. The only crueller thing than an army, is a nation that has no army and is uncivilized, beastly, and savage.[9]

Whittier, Mrs. Howe, and more strident erstwhile war-whoopers in the American Peace Society, now renewed their cries against war. In 1872 Sumner, smarting at Grant, joined the Liberal Republicans who were offering Greeley, and many in the peace movement followed. They succeeded in attaching to the party a campaign plank which read:

> We hold that it is the duty of the government in its intercourse with foreign nations to cultivate the friendships of peace by treating with all on fair and equal terms, regarding it alike dishonorable to demand what is not right or submit to what is wrong.[10]

This is not the first plank on peace adopted by a political party in the United States; it will be remembered that the Free Soil Party in 1852 had put forward the principle of arbitration (see Chapter VII). It is weak, vague, and equivocal; but can anyone point to a plank on peace that is anything else, thus far, in the platforms of the major parties?

But all the peace spokesmen did not back up Greeley, especially those among the die-hard abolitionists. Garrison (the non-voter) and many others joined in a greater or less degree with those who gathered in public squares or saloons to query:

> Should brave Ulysses be forgot,
> Who worked so long and well,
> On fields where fires of death were hot,
> And brave men fought and fell?

The regulars went the Liberal Republicans one better, but rang the bell of imperialistic protection:

The national government should seek to maintain honorable peace with all nations, protecting its citizens everywhere, and sympathizing with all peoples who strive for greater liberty.[11]

Until the rise of socialism into politics, no party ever offered a plank comparable for definiteness to the mild request for arbitration urged by the Prohibition Reform Party of 1876 (see also Chapter VII).

At any rate, however, the crust was broken; but by how slender an instrument! When the campaign of 1884 was getting up headway, the Republican managers thought it wise policy to issue a sixteen-page pamphlet on *Blaine and Peace.* But nothing more potent than the usual pious abstractions was offered. An optimist indeed would have been a person who stopped to think about these evidences of what the platform makers believed would win votes, and contrasted them with the hard facts rather sketchily adduced to spur their zeal by Dr. McMurdy:

Since this century began there has not been one entire year of peace. In its first fifteen years, war extended over all of Europe, and to this country. The next ten years, South and Central America and Mexico were the scenes of carnage. The next twenty-five years, the powers of Europe caused war in Africa and Asia.

Since 1800, England has had 54 wars; France, 42; Russia, 23; Austria, 14; Prussia, 9—142 wars, by five Christian nations, in 84 years.[12]

Since some of the wars were among these very nations—a fact which Dr. McMurdy in his peace evangelism failed to mention—the record was not so bad as it sounded. In sober truth, nevertheless, it was bad enough to make an honest thinker pause. Nor were these years conspicuously tinged with hopefulness. Yet the movement against war labored on. Said Alfred Love,

Some very good meaning people are alarmed at the idea of the peace cause being in any way connected with politics. The Universal Peace Union has long been laboring to accomplish this very result.

In the election of 1880 a crumb of cheer was flung to the peace movement's radical wing, by the victory of "Honest Jonathan" Chace of Rhode Island to the House of Representatives. Chace was a Quaker cotton manufacturer who refused to make any run for office but was selected for his outstanding business ability and party fidelity, and even the Grand Young Party, which then it was, refused to heed the criticisms of his views against war. As a Congressman for two terms he consistently refused to vote for military appropriation bills and would not nominate cadets for West Point or Annapolis. But he could do nothing especially vigorous or constructive, tied up as he was with the political machinery of intrenched industrial conservatism. In fact, he won his chief fame as a standpatter favoring a protective tariff in its extremest form.

The New Peace Congresses

No international peace conferences had been held since the decade of 1843 to 1853, except three small and unrepresentative meetings in 1867 at Geneva, in 1878 at Paris, and in 1882 at Brussels.

In 1889 a new series of conferences was begun. The first of these congresses was held in Paris coincidently with the Paris Exposition, and was planned by Charles Lemonnier, President of the International League of Peace and Liberty. Delegates both from the Universal Peace Union and the American Peace Society were present. Frederic Passy of France was a leading spirit, along with Hodgson Pratt and W. Evans Darby of England, Mrs. Belva A. Lockwood and R. B. Howard of the United States, Arturo Marcoartu of Spain, Fredrik Bajer of Denmark, and Henri La Fontaine of Belgium.

At approximately the same time the Inter-Parliamentary Conference for International Arbitration was formed, later to become the Interparliamentary Peace Union, then simply the Interparliamentary Union.

Between 1889 and the beginning of the World War, twenty of these international peace congresses were held, as follows:

1889....Paris	1902....Monaco
1890....London	1903....Rouen
1891....Rome	1904....Boston
1892....Berne	1905....Lucerne
1893....Chicago	1906....Milan
1894....Antwerp	1907....Munich
1896....Budapest	1908....London
1897....Hamburg	1910....Stockholm
1900....Paris	1912....Geneva
1901....Glasgow	1913....The Hague

With few exceptions these conferences have been perfunctory and tame affairs; the 1900 congress at Paris brought forth some spirited attacks on the colonial wars of the powers, at a time when the Boer War was ready to hand for a horrible example. They undoubtedly exerted a salutary check on temporary war propensities from time to time; but as for doing anything to cut to the roots of the war system they appear in retrospect almost startlingly insignificant. A certain ineffectiveness was inevitable from the desperate efforts made by the organizers of the congresses to woo the endorsement of the political, financial and society stalwarts of the times.

It must not be thought that while the peace movement was growing up in the United States, other nations were lagging behind. Instead, the truth is that England, Switzerland and the Scandinavian countries developed much of the time a peace effort more daring and more vigorous than ours. Our own peace leaders find their match or their superiors in Bertha von Suttner, Ludwig Quidde, Hodgson Pratt, Henry Richard, Elie Ducommun, Frederic Passy, Fredrik Bajer, Angela de Costa and numerous others.

In many respects the congresses held in the United States were less practical and realistic than most. The Chicago Conference of 1893 was a farce; the Exposition's Auxiliary Committee, under whose auspices it was held, decreed that no resolutions could be passed. Resolutions have their infinite weaknesses, but they often serve as points in which to center practical discussion; here the addresses and impromptu remarks

were uniformly vague, disjointed, ambiguous, and utterly without significance, even to those who uttered them.

The 1904 congress at Boston was far more worth while: it carried on the growing interest in anti-imperialist efforts, discussed the economic causes of war, disarmament, and arbitration. But its appeal was still too strongly directed to those who would not have lent it countenance had it promised anything genuinely likely to abolish warfare.

In 1889, following persistent agitation by the peace societies for over eight years, a conference was held at Washington by the American republics on the invitation of the United States to consider arbitration and mutual prosperity; but the United States delegates, all business men, were out for trade advantage most of all. A treaty was negotiated, providing for arbitration, and signed by eleven countries. Nobody took it seriously, however, and it was never ratified. And this was the auspicious occurrence from which sprang the Pan American Union.

Mohonk

On a lovely lake in the Catskill Mountains, Mr. Albert K. Smiley, together with his brothers Alfred and Daniel, in 1870 built a hotel. Albert Smiley had been head of a Friends' School in Providence, Rhode Island, and a Quaker-like serenity characterized the new venture. Here for many years he held conferences of humanitarians who were concerned over the well-being of the American Indians. In 1895 Mr. Smiley began to hold annual conferences on arbitration and peace. It was a kindly undertaking, and those who came were guests of a kindly host. Beginning with fifty visitors, the conferences reached by 1910 an attendance of three hundred.

The technical obstacles faced by peace advocates were discussed in these meetings, and many who came went away freshly stimulated to new efforts and better equipped for their tasks. But how inadequate these meetings seem to present-day ideals for conferences! The guests were all subject to Mr. Smiley's censorship and came on his invitation, though he usually consulted regarding names with his friend Benjamin F.

Trueblood, then President of the American Peace Society, and other trusted intimates.

A hand-picked group functioned under a hand-picked chairman, who as a matter of form was always nominated by the host and uniformly elected by acclamation. Controversy was not highly regarded; and the whole drift of the personnel grew closer and closer to the ideal of prestige, closely enmeshed in the political, religious, economic and social *status quo*.

Here and there a note of striking vigor was reached in the addresses; for some of the more outspoken Friends and others were sometimes present. But the proceedings year by year are about as moving as the *Social Register, Numbers,* or *The Book of the Dead.*

Outstanding militarists were always on hand, and in one year the Pugsly prize for the best essay on arbitration was awarded to a cadet at Annapolis, who demanded that pacifist methods be revised. Revised how? Suffice it to say that amid applause he read his insistence that "The 'minimum of safety' is a large army and a strong navy."

Seldom, I venture to state, has a mountain of peace discussion (piling up annually for a score of years) brought forth so insignificant a mouse.

We "Remember the Maine"

The rule of Spain over Cuba had been for many years a cruel despotism, based primarily on economic selfishness. Periodic insurrections had broken out but were quelled with neatness and dispatch. In 1895, however, following a tariff policy which sacrificed Cuban interests to those of Spanish business men, and the enactment of a tariff measure in the United States which did the same thing for this country, a revolt broke out which was less easily put down. Unemployment made Cuban workers available in large numbers for the rebellious army. Genuinely alarmed and casting a justifiably anxious eye in our direction, the Spaniards determined on ruthlessness as a means of speedily terminating the revolution, and put into desperate practice Sheridan's policy of leaving the inhabitants

nothing but their eyes to weep with over the war. Reprisal and retaliation followed; destruction of crops aroused the ire of good American commercialists and the competition in cruelty stirred the decent emotions of all classes.

Thanks to a combination of Mr. William Randolph Hearst's shrieking journalism, a coterie of pro-war Democrats in Congress, and a hang-over of war-excitement undissipated since the Venezuelan boundary dispute with the British, the stage was set for war. To ring up the curtain only some spectacular event was needed, some approach to an overt act. Publication through the Hearst press of a stolen letter written by the Spanish Ambassador containing aspersions on President McKinley was almost enough. But when the battleship *Maine* blew up in Havana harbor, from a cause as yet unknown to all but a few who have not chosen to speak otherwise than prudently, nothing more was needed.

Over the whole country indignation blazed, and so overwhelming was the popular outcry that the government yielded. Leaving Spain's offer of arbitration unanswered, we determined on war; and with no other choice before her, so did Spain.

As a war, it wasn't much; the actual fighting lasted only some four months. The Spaniards, outnumbered, outfinanced, outequipped, were everywhere defeated. Rarely were large and rich possessions more cheaply acquired; and the new sense of being a world power, stretching our might across far seas, gave the country an anodyne which easily soothed any pangs evoked by tales of embalmed beef fed to our soldiers.

Straight back to the Civil War we can trace the influences that now were working on the minds of the American people. At Mystic, three years before the war began, Dr. Ellen Goodell Smith exclaimed that "the war spirit was never so thoroughly and persistently educated into a people as it has been in our land since 1865." In 1890 a bill for a new military outlay of $180,000,000 was sponsored by the administration. "In the matter of the navy," said the American Peace Society's secretary, "we are going steadily astray and no one can prophesy where the evil will stop." [18] The Universal Peace Union re-

ported that the new Krag-Jorgenson rifles were arousing popular interest and that not only navalism but boys' brigades were on the increase. Howard University and other colleges started military training units; many a community began to consider introducing military drill into its public schools. Said Dr. Smith:

> The Grand Army of the Republic, the Sons of Veterans, the militia, the training camps, the naval and military colleges and schools, with thousands of youthful cadets who already march on our streets with all the importance of veterans, our Decoration Day, our holidays in remembrance of some deed of war, military event or hero, our glittering military encampments, attracting thousands of citizens to their brilliant annual parades,—these and many others are the promoters of, and educators in, the idea of warfare. From the close of our civil conflict until now, we have taught the glories of war, its honors, its emoluments.[14]

Against the tide, what intellectual force were the peace societies prepared to interpose? The Universal Peace Union was quick to speak when the war seemed imminent; but its record was marred in the superficial eyes of many who could see only a lack of sympathy with the cause of *Cuba libre,* and an apparent readiness to condone the Spanish rule. As a matter of fact, the Union had steadfastly urged Home Rule at least; its quarrel was with war as a method. In the years when an earlier revolt was in progress and arms were being smuggled into the island by our munition makers, a member of the Union boarded a filibustering vessel as it lay docked in Philadelphia, found contraband arms aboard, and started a protest to the mayors of Camden and Philadelphia, to Washington, and to the Spanish consul. The ship never left its port until the munitions were removed. Said the Union, little appreciating how it must sound to those whose hearts responded to a cry for freedom and who were unsatisfied with peace sans justice:

> We received commendation here and abroad. One of our Vice-Presidents soon after visited Madrid, and was handsomely received by the government.[15]

The conservative bodies, on the other hand, were far from

definitely committed against either war or imperialism. A syllabus used by the American Peace Society on *Peace and Arbitration Topics,* issued in 1886 and used for a dozen years, conveys no hint that in a refusal to support war there is any approach to the problem. Indeed, such a thing was not to be considered. At the arbitration conference of 1896 in Washington, Dr. James B. Angell of the University of Michigan, took pains to point out a very different challenge:

> Let us stand before the world, prepared to defend ourselves, if need be, with our good right arms, as becomes those who believe that there are calamities more dreadful to a nation than war.

At the same place, the Reverend L. T. Chamberlain of New York "heartily admitted" that

> war is not the worst of conceivable evils. We believe that, in many an instance, it is, on the one side at least, a fully justified alternative.

One of Minnesota's sons of prosperity desired to say:

> I do not believe that it is the sentiment of the great American people, that our mission is to be confined strictly within our own territorial borders. Our need of arbitration between ourselves and Great Britain, is undoubtedly emphasized by the fact of our youthful combativeness, but not by any desire on our part to retire from the contest for a world-wide commercial supremacy. We do not wish to restrain our efforts within our own borders.

In the same interesting year, the Mohonk Conference was made safe and sane indeed, since the host decreed that he did not wish it to be considered as a peace conference in any other sense than arbitration. It seemed not altogether inappropriate when General A. C. Barnes rose to remark:

> Cromwell is said to have inscribed upon his cannon the words, "Open Thou our lips, O Lord, and our mouths shall show forth Thy praise." Are not the monster guns of the Indiana entitled as well to bear an inscription? The text that I would suggest for them is, "Blessed are the peacemakers."

A couple of years later, when the war was beginning to liven up, guests entering the Mohonk grounds perceived with new

pleasure the huge flag hung to greet them. President Seelye of Smith College was genuinely relieved:

I was glad, and I think you all were, to catch the first sight of the old flag waving, more majestically than ever, over the entrance to this house, where we have so frequently been welcomed. It was the assurance to us that the heart of our host was as loyal as ever, and that this Conference in the interests of arbitration was not to hinder the government in the vigorous and successful prosecution of the war in which we are engaged.

Colonel George E. Waring, Jr., conspicuous for his organization of New York City's "white wings," accepted the chairmanship of the conference, and loyally emphasized certain restrictions:

I especially urge all speakers, whenever they feel their angry passions rising, on one side or the other, to remember that it is Mr. Smiley's earnest wish that nothing whatever should be said with reference to the present state of affairs between this country and Spain. In order to establish fixed lines within which all speakers shall confine themselves, it will be safe and prudent to say that nothing which has happened since the meeting of this Conference last year, or which may be expected to happen before the meeting of next year, is to be referred to in any way.

Significantly, the proceedings reveal that

Mr. Smiley regretted the absence from this Conference of many who have been members in former years, but he was glad to welcome others in their places.

Senator Hoar, in Washington, asked an important question related to just such performances as this one at Mohonk; and in line with oratorical precedent, did not hesitate to supply the answer:

I want to ask what was it which created this war; which keeps it up, and which created and keeps up the hatred, and will make war break out again and again for centuries to come, unless human nature be changed or be different in their bosoms from what it is in ours? It is because you keep a padlock on your lips.[16]

Yet all had not kept silent. The American Peace Society had

already made gains toward a rejuvenation. Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood, a scholarly Quaker, formerly President of Wilmington College in Ohio and of Penn College in Iowa, was chosen as Secretary in 1892. Trueblood had been President of the Christian Arbitration Society organized in 1886, had traveled widely, and spoke French, Italian and German. New "literature" was prepared, new officials added, the constitution was altered slightly to make the Society's work more influential, and, still more important, Secretary Trueblood infused the Society with a new vigor and depth of purpose. He was never really a radical; but he was of far sturdier stuff, for example, than Beckwith. The score of years, roughly speaking, in which he served the Society, brought it up to a new level.

The Advocate of Peace, edited by Trueblood, opposed the Democratic drive for the official recognition of Cuban belligerency, expressed disbelief without further evidence that the *Maine* was blown up from the outside, and deplored the appeals of the sensational press. In its issue of April, 1898—last before the declaration of war—it declared that

> If the President's policy fails, and we involve ourselves in hostilities with Spain, it will be difficult enough, from any point of view, to justify armed intervention either for Cuban independence or the arrest of Spanish inhumanities.

After the war had begun, it said, in its May number:

> To say that "war in the air" brought this on is to say nothing. The truth is that it was war in the blood, sowed thick there a generation ago. . . . We are simply reaping today the harvest of the warlike instincts which were then created or developed. This is the secret of our recent jingoism. . . . If we could have gotten through another decade or two without war, our jingoism would have died out.

Despite its faulty use of psychological terms, the observation is based on a sound principle. Trueblood lived up to his name; for in June he wrote:

> No man is a patriot, in any worthy sense, who treads down his judgment and his conscience and goes with his country to do what he is solemnly convinced is iniquitous.

Reprinting in *The Advocate of Peace* from *The Land of Sunshine* the following defiance, Trueblood held firm throughout the war, carrying with him many of the rank and file in the Society:

> The organized effort of the administration papers to scare us out of discussing the Philippine question is as foolish as it will be fruitless. To yell "traitor" to every American who dares to think without asking Mr. Hanna's permission shows that the yellers know as little of business as of morals. For this is not a nation of slaves. We like fair play and free speech, and we are not so stupid as not to know when they are assailed. We are not ready for a Kaiser and *lèse majesté* and all that. Kaisering, in a Republic, has to be very judicious, else in a moment we shall turn and laugh in his face, and the "divine robes" will fall away, and the servant of the people will stand naked to the rebuke of his masters.[17]

William Lloyd Garrison (the second) was another who stood clearly against the war and the ferocious campaign on the Filipinos. He published nine sonnets on "William McKinley," a poem on "The Church Recreant," another on "Aguinaldo," and issued these militant verses in a pamphlet which he called *The Nation's Shame.* Here and there a professor was dismissed for pacifist views. In Boston the Reverend Charles G. Ames, coincidently with the start of the war, delivered in the Church of the Disciples a plain anti-war sermon. Dr. Anna Howard Shaw refused to hang out a flag from her house, though every one else did so in her block. When questioned about it, she answered, "When the war is over, we will raise the flag." William Everett also made a daring Phi Beta Kappa address at Harvard in June of 1900, on Patriotism, in which he ventured to exclaim:

> Philosophy says, "Hold!" with the terror of the voice within, with majesty of the voice from above, to Americans now: and with the spirit of Socrates returning to earth, it bids them know what they mean by the words they use, or they may be crowning as a lofty emotion that which is only an unreasoning passion, and clothing with the robes of duty what is only a superstition. . . .
>
> No more gallant work was ever undertaken than that of the

courageous Anti-Imperialist League. This organization exposed the horrors of the Philippine war—the water cure, the orders given by the infamous General Jacob H. Smith in Samar to kill all males over ten years of age, and the wholesale wiping out of villages, including men, women and children. It was possible for a portion of the people to realize that in the Philippines the United States was guilty of much the same acts that public opinion had become infuriated by in Cuba.

The Honorable George S. Boutwell, declaring that "the administration has entered upon a policy of aggression, injustice, and war," aroused the members of this League in Young's Hotel, Boston, early in 1899, to pass a resolution which read:

> *Resolved,* That we protest against this attempt to degrade the Great Republic into a Great Empire, to destroy its moral leadership of the world, and to make it succumb to ideas and principles which it was born to oppose; and we solemnly appeal to the conscience of the American people to frustrate it forever by returning with tenfold loyalty to the "spirit of '76."

The purpose was more different, alas, than the spirit; and the conscience of the American people was advised more successfully by Mr. Hearst than by the small minority who dared outspokenly to oppose the government.

Nothing served better to show the public temper than the experience of the Universal Peace Union. This society was strongly anti-imperialistic. It made no secret of its opposition to the war; but it was throttled too early to make an effective protest during the carnage.

Moved by a genuine desire to aid peace work and impressed by the list of notables whose endorsement of his labor Alfred Love had been able to secure, the city fathers of Philadelphia had turned over to the Universal Peace Union a room in Independence Hall. Here, on the first floor of the east wing, where the United States Supreme Court was first organized, the Union conducted public meetings and maintained a peace museum. From this palladium of liberty Alfred Love, three days before war was declared, addressed a letter to the Queen of Spain. The letter urged the Queen to follow a conciliatory

policy, to set Cuba free, to indemnify the United States for the *Maine* disaster, stressing the greater injustice and wrong certain to follow war. As spokesman for what was technically an international body, he urged a world view, and pledged peace work, as a loyal citizen, in the United States. Unfortunately for Love (and love) the epistle reached New York just in time to be returned as unmailable on account of the opening of war.

For several years one of the Union's interests had been the development of a peace flag. Several were tried, but finally general opinion settled on a design effected by Henry Pettit, consisting of the national flag surrounded by a wide white border, across the top of which sometimes ran the slogan, "Peace to All Nations." Peace societies in many lands adopted the idea, and peace flags were freely exchanged for display. An all but forgotten Spanish peace flag was unearthed in the Union's headquarters by an enterprising reporter and what a sensation was that!

Learning also that a letter to the Queen of Spain had been returned as unmailable, the reporter nosed around until he obtained part of the facts, whereupon an accurate account was told him on his pledge to distort nothing. But this was war, and a scoop was a scoop. There was no excitement in this story; but by adroit handling it became a scandal.

A warped report appeared in the *Bulletin,* and bedlam was let loose. To his dismay, Love became the center of a raging whirlwind. It was of no use for him to explain, or for such men as former Secretary of State Foster to uphold the Union; on the society descended all the suppressed venom which had been worked up for the Spaniards, who were less conveniently near at hand.

Swiftly the City of Brotherly Love kicked out the Universal Peace Union; and when for safety's sake the Society's faithful officers carried precious emblems, papers, furnishings and exhibits through the sidewalks to 1305 Arch Street, furious patriots taunted them and occasionally knocked their burdens from their hands, threatening more serious violence. I confess to a thrill of interest in coming across, not long ago, among

the relics of the old Universal Peace Union, a stained and badly rotted Spanish peace flag!

But more serious by far was the manner in which the respectable took alarm and failed to identify themselves longer with the movement. In summing up the record for 1900, Love was obliged to say, "We have missed some of our former contributors. Inroads are being made by the military spirit and the war power that we must resist," and to add, "The tide has set against us." From Washington Belva Lockwood wrote to Alfred Love in her bold, dashing hand, "Friend Love: Another crisis is passed. I have called another Peace Meeting (May 18) and have survived. Although I advertised in the papers, and in the churches, sent out 100 printed cards, and had the meeting announced in the various clubs, something less than 100 people were present. . . ." The Mystic peace meetings were continued and were well worth while; but they did not seem to have the old appeal. Soon complaints were made that the work there was not being taken so seriously as it should, and that more people ought to come. The nature and peace summer school conducted in the Grove by Daniel Batchellor proved to be a drawing card; but generally the old spirit was dying.

A new crop of war boosters was unloosed by the end of the conflict. In 1904 the United Spanish War Veterans was organized, and thus at annual encampments such resounding sentiments were to be perpetrated as was spoken by the Commander-in-Chief at Dodge City, Kansas, in 1927, describing the conduct of our troops in the Philippine occupation:

> The Americans taught the world that brutality and cruelty were unnecessary in war and that war could be waged as a humanitarian necessity.[18]

We emerged also as an imperialist power, with Cuba a protectorate, with Porto Rico ours, and with the Philippines secured for a paltry twenty million dollars. How men may find the most pious reasons for national conquests is shown by President McKinley. This is his story, as told to a group of Methodists:

I walked the floor of the White House night after night until midnight; and I am not ashamed to tell you, gentlemen, that I went down on my knees and prayed Almighty God for light and guidance more than one night. And one night late it came to me this way—I don't know how it was, but it came:

(1) That we could not give them back to Spain—that would be cowardly and dishonorable.

(2) That we could not turn them over to France or Germany—our commercial rivals in the Orient—that would be bad business and discreditable.

(3) That we could not leave them to themselves—they were unfit for self-government—and they would soon have anarchy and misrule worse than Spain's war.

(4) That there was nothing left for us to do but to take them all, and to educate the Filipinos, and uplift and civilize and christianize them as our fellow-men for whom Christ also died.[19]

But the new possessions had definite value in naval strategy; and what can strategy do without an adequate protection policy? Thus reasoned the proponents of a larger navy; and now the drive for increased armaments was perpetual and insatiate. One wave after another of militarism, expressing itself in various kinds of "preparedness" legislation, swept across the city on the Potomac. Captain Richmond P. Hobson, the hero of Santiago Harbor, went forth a-lecturing, to urge the first navy among world powers, costing $1,500,000,000, so that we might thereby fulfill "America's Mighty Mission in the World."

War was again sowing the fertile seed for its self-perpetuation. And the peace movement of the United States was now destined to leap forward into a fine frenzy of optimism, grounded on the rather tenuous results of two conferences in the calm and level country of The Netherlands.

The Hague

On the twenty-fourth of August, 1898, Count Muravieff, the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs, issued the Tsar's rescript which brought about the first Hague Conference in 1899. The rescript started off:

The maintenance of general peace and a possible reduction of the excessive armaments which weigh upon all nations present

themselves, in the existing condition of the whole world, as the ideal toward which the endeavors of all governments should be directed.

The humanitarian and magnanimous spirit of His Majesty the Emperor, my August Master, is wholly convinced of this view.

What had convinced the August Master? There are a multitude of reasons: 1. He had been reminded of the historic effort of Alexander to achieve peace through the Holy Alliance, and determined to follow suit more practically. This view was entertained by numerous Friends since a movement of Quakers, prior to 1895, had undertaken to suggest such an act. 2. He was influenced by the Interparliamentary Union, especially the meeting at Budapest in 1896. This idea was fondly cherished by the members of that body. 3. He was aroused by reading Jan Bliokh's book. In *The Contemporary Review* Dr. E. J. Dillon set forth this opinion, which was widely accepted in this country, peace societies hailing the work as "the book that moved the Czar."

In later years, however, Dr. Dillon established contact with further facts, and he completely changed his former view. In his book on *The Eclipse of Russia* he grows impatient with those who ascribe such laudable motives to the "noble-minded sovereign," and apparently forgetting his earlier misinstruction frets because "mankind prefers romance to reality." His more recent evidence seems indubitable, however.

Briefly, it amounts to this. Germany had recently been perfecting a new type of artillery and equipping its army with this powerful gun. France had followed suit. Austria and Russia must do likewise or be endangered. But neither could afford it. Already heavily taxed, the Russian people could not safely be pressed further. Could not Austria, always a potential enemy, be persuaded, by a direct appeal, to join Russia in keeping to the present weapons, both countries thereby saving money and yet retaining toward each other the same military ratio? So argued Muravieff and Kuropatkin, military leaders. Count Witte, Finance Minister, did not rely on Austria to accept the proposal as anything other than an admission of

weakness. He set his wits to work. "I knew that what was wanted," said he, "was some ruse by means of which we could get Austria to stay her hand and discuss disarmament in lieu of investing in the improved gun." Soon Witte, who had often toyed with a far-off dream of a pacific league of nations, though not believing in it as a policy for anything far this side of the millennium, decided that Russia would doubtless gain by starting statesmen to talking about it. Eventually Muravieff embodied the idea in the famous rescript. The Tsar approved the paper, for which he was complimented by Witte, who "smiled at the humanitarian wrappings which had thus been vouchsafed to Kuropatkin's simple ideas, for he knew that the whole scheme was a piece of hypocrisy and guile." [20]

Nevertheless, to peace advocates hungry for every crumb, it fell as a luscious morsel. Edward Everett Hale started a weekly paper, *The Peace Crusade,* and kept it going until the conference occurred. Anna Evreinoff came from Russia to boost the idea, and was the center of attraction at many gatherings. The American Peace Society worked hard for a favorable public interest, and the Universal Peace Union held meetings in Philadelphia and elsewhere three times a week.

As we have seen, however, the first conference, from the angle of disarmament, was a fiasco. The second, in 1907, was scarcely more effective, save that it did make some contribution to the technique by which the judges of a world court should be selected.

But nobody would ever learn from the majority of the peace movement's spokesmen that everything had not gone sublimely well.

"The temple of Janus is soon to be closed forever," said one peace leader. Trueblood, who was frankly skeptical of "humanizing" war, nevertheless wrote in 1899 that "the Conference, when its acts are ratified, will have completed the organization of the peace movement and placed peace at the front in international relations as the supreme guiding idea in the future. . . . War cannot reverse the new spirit of fellowship which it has demonstrated." He even went so far as to say that the

delegates "had more than fulfilled the highest expectations of even the advanced friends of peace."[21] A leading Friend asserted the faith that "nations do not care now to meet one another in war."

Alfred Love, however, regarded the conference merely as a step ahead, and stated that "the goal may be a long way off, but if we never take the first step we shall never reach the end."

In between the first and second Hague conferences the Russo-Japanese War occurred; Tolstoy wrote his strong letter on the war, to have it sneered at here by *The Outlook* and by prominent clergymen; Theodore Roosevelt was one more military recipient of the Nobel Prize; Andrew Carnegie delivered his "Rectorial Address" on a league of peace; the American Peace Society had gone so far as to publish a pamphlet by the Reverend Algernon S. Crapsey (not yet branded as a "heretic") on *Passive Resistance, Jesus' Method of Government;* and at the Boston Peace Congress and elsewhere Belva Lockwood and other pacifists were crying the virtues of "pacigerence."

For years the movement against war had been trying to settle on a Peace Day to celebrate. Washington's Birthday was tried for a time, but it seemed insufficiently logical, April 18 was set, as commemorating the Pan American Arbitration Treaty, but naturally it called forth scant enthusiasm. The third Sunday in December, as nearest to Christmas was also urged as a Peace Day for many years, but had its limitations.

The Hague conference, at last, provided a new opportunity. May 18, the Tsar's birthday, was the happy date. Sincerely thinking that the Little Father in St. Petersburg had piously started a new pacific revolution, the peace societies united in taking up the idea. The American School Peace League carried it to the children, the International Council of Women and the W.C.T.U. carried it into homes, the American Peace Society and the Universal Peace Union spread it assiduously through their branches.

It is now endorsed and sponsored by the National Council for Prevention of War and the World Federation of Education

Associations as "World Goodwill Day." And so a peace movement which knows the Tsar of bygone Russia as symbol of a vile tyranny and a patron of imperialism, conquest, oppression and war, unsmilingly goes on its sober way, hailing this birthday as the symbol of the new order that is to be.

Oh, what a paradox is there! Well might the peace movement borrow from Whitman a careless gesture of abandon:

> Do I contradict myself?
> Very well then I contradict myself.
> (I am large, I contain multitudes.) [22]

The Pre-War Optimism

In the United States, remote from the Balkan and Russo-Japanese wars, the decade from 1904 to 1914 was a buoyant period. Progressive political ferment was accumulating and found release in the Bull Moose campaign or the "New Freedom" of Woodrow Wilson. The Boston Peace Congress of 1904, the Nobel award to President Roosevelt, the National Arbitration and Peace Congress of 1907 in New York, the benevolent efforts of President Taft for mild arbitration treaties, were influences which combined to build up in the peace societies a rosy optimism. Critical self-analysis was rare within the movement, and the criticism leveled at it from without was too unreasoned to have value.

If anything, the movement was more conservative than for many years. The stout radicalism of the Universal Peace Union was succumbing to the anæsthesia of old age; the best pacifist material it had was a new reprint of Adin Ballou's book of 1846. More deeply committed than ever to reactionary economic groups were the major peace societies. Instead of allying themselves with the rising tide of labor and the assertive political liberalism of the time, the peace forces were on the whole controlled by the interests seeking to hold back the swelling tide of social unrest.

To the American Peace and Arbitration League, President Taft declared, during one of those dinners which, as he said on a similar occasion, create "a desire to be unanimous,"

. . . Because we are in favor of universal peace, and in favor of arbitration to secure it, that does not mean that we are in favor of our country giving up that which we now use for securing peace, to wit: our army and our navy. . . . To secure peace, we must, however, be fully prepared for war. . . .

The President was a bit aggrieved. "During the recent strike in Philadelphia," he went on to complain, "the police were unable to awe the mob. A company of militia were called out, and being so hampered by orders not to use their guns, they became a plaything for the rioters, and suffered"—what did they suffer?—"unjust humiliation." [23]

Mr. Henry Clews, famous Wall Street banker and an officer in several peace societies, also reminded the Third American Peace Congress at Baltimore in 1911, that "the best preventive of war, under existing circumstances, is being ready for war," and endorsed the building of more warships.

The Reverend Newell Dwight Hillis, who was soon to exemplify it, spoke before the 1907 Peace Congress on "The Moral Damage of War"; and at the same meeting the Most Reverend John Ireland laid an anchor to windward: "We should not say that Christ's Gospel makes war a crime in all cases."

Despite the defects of quality which may be discernible from this distance, quantitatively things were looking up—a not uncommon situation in more fields than one. The American Peace Society had become the mouthpiece, more or less, of two affiliated groups—the Peace Association of Friends in America and the Intercollegiate Peace Association. The American Society for the Judicial Settlement of Disputes was getting under way; the American School Peace League was organized in 1908; the American Association for International Conciliation was founded in 1907; the Association of Cosmopolitan Clubs, started in 1903, was beginning to be a broadening influence on many a campus as were also the International Polity Clubs; the American Peace and Arbitration League, under the leadership of President Taft, Colonel Roosevelt, Andrew Carnegie and Mr. Clews, was pushing its fourfold program of universal peace by conciliation and arbitration, a permanent court, treaties, and

"adequate" armament; and the International Peace Forum, with John Wesley Hill as President and Mr. Clews as Treasurer, was "especially active among the churches and the commercial organizations." The League of Peace, after changing its name to the League to Enforce Peace, took the center of the stage.

One of the widely spread journals of the time was the last-named society's organ, *The Peace Forum.* Some idea of the movement which tried to cope with the problem of war may be gained from its issue of August, 1914. It contained, in the order given, the following matter:

An address by Mr. Taft describing the inevitable failure of socialistic community experiments;
A note showing how public ownership fails;
A quotation from Dean Inge on eternal life;
An editorial quoting Bainbridge Colby against the recent demonstrations of economic radicals in churches;
An editorial defending armaments against a criticism by the Reverend Charles F. Dole;
An editorial protesting the proposed treaty to recompense Colombia for Panama;
An editorial demonstrating that Negroes make good soldiers;
An editorial asking more financial backing for American art;
An editorial protesting attacks on rich people as "malefactors of great wealth";
An editorial stating that the assassination of the Archduke Francis Ferdinand is not likely "to increase the probabilities of international war in Europe";
An editorial showing grief at the throttling of business by the government;
An editorial advocating thrift;
An editorial favoring the protective tariff;
An editorial upholding arbitration as likely to keep down war taxes;
Three pages of news notes mainly calculated to show the harm of economic radicalism but including a protest against talk of annexing Mexico;
An article against independence, within a generation, for the Philippines;
An article on "The Industrial Strike a National Menace";
An article urging a large merchant marine;
An installment of a story entitled "The Mess of Pottage."

This sort of sentiment, mixed with a strong and honest desire for a friendly world, had funneled down into the two great foundations for the promotion of peace, established, respectively, by Edwin Ginn and Andrew Carnegie. In 1910 Mr. Ginn, far from an optimist, foresaw a long need for public education against war, and donated a million dollars for that purpose. First known as the International School of Peace, it was changed in December to the World Peace Foundation.

The by-laws of the corporation state that it "is constituted for the purpose of educating the people of all nations to a full knowledge of the waste and destructiveness of war, its evil effects on present social conditions and on the well-being of future generations, and to promote international justice and the brotherhood of man, and, generally, by every practical means to promote peace and good will among all mankind."

"Some people," said Mr. Ginn, "think that we are very near the solution of this military problem. I am not of their opinion. It will take many millions of dollars to carry this work to a successful issue. . . . We must seek out and employ those who have the spirit of a Burritt, a Phillips, a Garrison, a Godfrey, a Savonarola."

Later in the same year, Andrew Carnegie sought to supply some additional dollars—ten million of them. In his letter transferring the gift, he said:

> Lines of future action can not be wisely laid down. Many may hav to be tried, and having full confidence in my Trustees I leav to them the widest discretion as to the mesures and policy they shall from time to time adopt, only premising that the one end they shall keep unceasingly in view until it is attaind, is the speedy abolition of international war between so-cald civilized nations. . . .

It was inevitable that the piling up of European armaments, the unrepentant old diplomacy, the balance of power, and above all the increasing race for trade and colonial supremacy, should seem less menacing to eyes that were filled with visions of an immediate and rosy dawn. The peace congress of 1907 fairly oozed with assurances that "the movement for international

peace is not beginning, but is now approaching its consummation." Every new year enhanced the ecstasy of faith.

"It is beyond all doubt," said *The Advocate of Peace* in 1911, "that the nations are moving toward world peace." *The Peace Forum* was certain in 1913 that "the age is ready for peace. The world is weary of war." "International morals," it pointed out, "are now on a so much higher plane, and the financial and commercial and industrial interests of all the larger nations are so bound up with each other, that . . . statesmen realize how ruinous it would be for them to fight." In May, 1914, Rear Admiral F. E. Chadwick assured the Mohonk crusaders that "the Emperor William is strong for peace," thereby voicing what was a general view among the peace societies. Almost overnight, historically considered, to these selfsame groups the Kaiser, who like them believed in peace by preparedness, was to become the personal ambassador of hell upon this otherwise fair earth.

As the World War gradually embroiled almost all Europe, there was a swift reaction toward peace in the United States. Cartoons against war filled the press. Henry Ford equipped the *Oscar II* in 1915 with some of the peace movement's best brains and some of its worst, and essayed a gallant gesture which aroused a certain respect in Scandinavia, met cold indifference among the belligerents, and elicited ribald snickers at home. The campaign for preparedness in 1916 swept away the militant opposition, and enlisted the prestige of the President and the major peace societies on behalf of increased armaments.

We did not know it; but we were getting ready for war.

The Peace Movement Leads the War

Few journals not directly organs of the peace societies devoted more space to the problems of the War in Europe and the coming peace than did *The New Republic.* But by early 1917 black headlines screamed across its cover and it was soon crying for war and persuading Norman Angell to send from England articles expected to line up American pacifists behind the war policy. The President, feeling in his heart a respect

for pacifists had already let it be known that his mind held them in contempt; and the nation followed suit.

"Nothing could be more horrible than the gayety of nations on the eve of wars . . ." wrote John White Chadwick in 1903, in his *Life of Channing*. But in 1917, with whistles shrieking joyously, church bells clanging as if in relief from a surfeit of decorum, with cheers and hastening light feet among its people, the United States gave itself to what Noah Worcester, a century before, had called "the insane policy of fighting for peace."

President Wilson emphasized his disbelief in "peace at any price," and soon the phrase was on everybody's lips. It had been used by President W. H. P. Faunce of Brown University and Professor N. P. Gilman of the Meadville Theological School at Mohonk, before the War with Spain; Beecher had thundered it out to his Brooklyn congregation in 1870; years before that Lord Palmerston had sneered by it at the pacifism of the English Quaker rebel, John Bright; still earlier it had been uttered by Douglas Jerrold, the British wit; in fact, it was used, not in condemnation but in praise, by Cicero![24] But it was an unanswerable "argument," suffused with all the magic fire of divine inspiration, and it did once more a mighty work.

President Wilson, man of peace, who had said in 1916 that "force will not accomplish anything that is permanent,"[25] eventually called for "force to the utmost, force without stint or limit, the righteous and triumphant force that shall make right the law of the world."[26]

The announcement that there should be "no conscription of the unwilling," was speedily followed by torture and heavy sentences handed out to extreme conscientious objectors. The usual war terrorism against all but standardized views was enforced, far more rigorously than ever before; it was safe to hold an independent opinion only so long as you held it *incommunicado*.

Over the whole country, fathers and mothers, sisters and brothers made sacrifices bravely, all the way from self-denial of luxuries to the loss of loved ones, while new millionaires in

the making pushed the number of their tribe up to over 21,000.

It was indeed a world war now; 93 per cent of the whole globe's population was drawn in. Neutral countries had a combined population of only 130,000,000 as against 1,700,000,000 for the belligerents. In a concentrated fashion not visualized when President Dwight of Yale wrote poems against war exactly one hundred years before:

> Still roars the trump's funereal sound,
> "To arms!" the startled hills rebound;
> War's iron car in thunder rolls
> From medial climes to distant poles.

There were those who did not yield to the war program and appeal; but the public heard no good of them. Eugene Debs magnificently assured himself of immortality by his courageous stand; others, equally courageous, made only a ripple in the newspapers. In Washington the American Union Against Militarism did yeoman service for a time, until, as the Civil Liberties Bureau, its offices, then in Fifth Avenue, New York, were raided amid a cordon of bluecoats that looked like a police department field day. The Young Democracy, venturing to start even amid the war a movement of youth to further social justice and make a later war less likely, was also raided and all but forced out of business. The Collegiate Anti-Militarism League was speedily ground out of sight by the draft and the Terror. Los Angeles Christian pacifists were hounded down and mobbed. The Emergency Peace Federation, having failed to keep the country out of war, swung into the work of the People's Council; but met the fate of all and sundry pacifists. The Fellowship of Reconciliation bravely carried on, but was immature and could reach only a few. In camps, in prison, in the "outside" expecting momentary incarceration, many a pacifist exemplified a way of life irreconcilable with war despite the public pressure against him and his kind.

Many, also, under such a terrific pressure, fell away as in all other wars. As a matter of cold fact, much of the most active leadership for the war cause was furnished by ex-peace workers. The movement had laid tentative plans for a great cele-

bration, in 1915, of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the first peace organizations. But after diluting it to a celebration of a hundred years of peace with Great Britain, they settled down to "sell" and celebrate the way of war. So far as I can discover, none of the peace societies existing in 1914—except some of the non-violent sects and a little remnant of the Universal Peace Union—stood out against the War. On the contrary, they became its faithful handmaids.

The Christian clergy did not all go wild; some of them, troubled but seeing no call to oppose the War, sought to find for it a basis in good will. "I never heard a warrior attempt to justify war by an appeal to the law of love," said Henry C. Wright, three-quarters of a century before, in criticizing the warring parsons. A whole century earlier Samuel Whelpley had voiced the same criticism: "'But I say unto you, love your enemies.' What pains have been taken to prove this precept consistent with war, and killing our enemies!" Nevertheless the dean of a great theological seminary essayed the task by expounding the possibilities of "killing in love" and circulated a prayer for students, which said, "May those of us who will bring our brothers to death do the deed without hate, eager to meet them again, sometime and somewhere to do the will of God together." [27]

William Jennings Bryan devoted his talents, such as they were, to the prosecution of the War, though in 1916 he had told the Mohonkers that "there is no honor that we can secure or defend by going into this War that is comparable with the honor that we can win if we can persuade the warring to turn, like prodigal sons, from the husks on which they have fed. . . ." The 1917 Bryan considered that "before the Government acts, discussion is proper; after action, obedience is a duty." [28]

Rabbi Joseph Silverman, who had spoken for peace at the arbitration congress in 1907, carried his pro-war influence to Jewry. Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, who in 1911 had branded war "a violation of the law of God," [29] did likewise. Through the Jewish Welfare Board the American Jews shared fully in the whole war campaign.

No one person, probably, carried on a more varied and unremitting personal pro-war service than Cleveland Hoadley Dodge, great-grandson of that David who had hurled defiance at the giant Mars a hundred years before.

Clarence Darrow, freethinker and friend of liberty, announced in December, 1917, "I find the arguments that were once used by German sympathizers are today the arguments of the pacifists." [80]

The American School Peace League became the American School Citizenship League, and pledged its "wholehearted support to the Government in this struggle for freedom."

The Christian Socialist exhibited the power of a great consecration by going down in the records as first of all Socialist papers to come out for the war. *The Appeal to Reason,* a Socialist journal run by the iconoclastic E. Haldeman-Julius, became *The New Appeal,* dispensing with reason altogether and swinging behind the great crusade. Upton Sinclair espoused the liberalism of President Wilson with certain reservations, and Messrs. Spargo and Walling left the Socialist Party and organized the pro-war Social Democratic League.

Scott Nearing got himself gloriously arrested, an honor he had merited though not guilty, and Rose Pastor Stokes and Kate Richards O'Hare likewise symbolized a large wing of Socialists not inclined to follow tamely into war as had the European Socialists at the signal from their war lords.

A coterie of obstreperous I.W.W. vindicated their theory that the upper classes were none too bright, and were made to rot for it in moldy prisons. Mr. Samuel Gompers, however, having become a convert to preparedness through the assiduous cultivation, it is said, of John Hays Hammond, was a ready salesman for the government and among the labor unions performed an able warrior's function.

Benjamin F. Trueblood might have withstood even the pressure of the war appeal in 1917. He had laid down active work in 1913 following a serious impairment of health; he died in October, 1916. At first no change from his policies was conspicuous. Harking back to the early Christian era, the American Peace Society's journal had stoutly contended, in Novem-

ber, 1916, that "the supreme fact of the Christian tradition was then, and ought to be now, that Jesus Christ was a pacifist."

But as soon as war was certain, the Society devoted itself chiefly to a crusade of moral suasion, to bring peace advocates behind the government. It labored with the Friends, many of whom responded at least to the extent of subscribing heavily to Liberty Bonds, and it turned an acrimonious countenance toward conscientious objectors and other misguided recalcitrants who did not join it in its change of heart. "This certainly is no time," it warned in a pamphlet entitled *The War for Peace,* "for a loyalty of squinting constructions, or for behavior of a doubtful sort on the part of anyone within the United States."

The League to Enforce Peace came out with an avowal that "we are engaged with our allies in precisely the kind of a war the League's program holds to be both justifiable and necessary."

Before the War, the World Peace Foundation had issued pamphlets of a strongly outspoken character. In discussing armament propaganda, for example, it was not averse to such phrases as "present monstrous armaments," "frightful extravagances and waste." In 1911, to take a fairly typical sample, it announced that

> The World Peace Foundation in Boston has just published, under the title of "Syndicates for War," a special pamphlet devoted to the exposure of this ruthless despoiling of the public treasury for private and corporate gain. It is a reprint of some startling letters to the New York *Evening Post,* revealing a mass of confessed and indisputable facts of the situation in England almost incredible in their grossness. The situation is undoubtedly almost as bad in Germany, France and the United States.

Since the War the Foundation has carried on its valuable work of making facts accessible to students of international affairs. But as for taking a strong attitude against armament drives, big navy bills, et cetera, it is silent. Its work now "is conducted impartially, without discrimination between opposing views on any subject and without any effort on the part of

the Foundation to suggest the conclusion which should be drawn from the basic facts presented." And this is "the spirit of a Burritt, a Phillips, a Garrison, a Godfrey, a Savonarola!"

The change dates from the War, when the Foundation swung into line with the pro-war platform. Mr. Ginn in 1911 had selected President David Starr Jordan of Stanford University as Chief Director, and the two acting together had selected additional Directors and a Board of Trustees. Dr. Jordan in 1916 became a center of attack by preparedness orators. "Now that we are in the War," he said later on, "the shortest way out is forward"; but his earlier insistence on peace brought criticism on the Foundation. In late 1916 the Foundation was reorganized so that he "never resigned nor was I ever removed."

President Lowell, one of the Trustees, his more recent performance in the Sacco-Vanzetti case notwithstanding, did preserve during the War a fine attitude toward academic freedom in Harvard; but he was desperately desirous that we go into the War, being not only something of an Anglophile but an ardent believer in the League to Enforce Peace. Lowell threw his influence against Jordan and the anti-war handful. From that day to this the spirit eulogized by Edwin Ginn has been as alien to the organization as the great comet that lighted the skies in celebration of his princely gift. Will Halley's heavenly body find on its return in 1985 even the ghost of Ginn's original intention?

When the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace sought incorporation in 1910 in the District of Columbia, it enumerated nine objects. The first one read, "To promote a general acceptance of peaceable methods in the settlement of international disputes." Its first great opportunity to demonstrate its faith in peaceable methods came in less than seven years. What happened?

Immediately upon the declaration of war, the organization sent to every country in the world a unanimous resolution stating

> That the Trustees of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, assembled for their annual meeting, declare hereby

their belief that the most effectual means of promoting durable international peace is to prosecute the war against the Imperial German Government to final victory for democracy, in accordance with the policy declared by the President of the United States.

For democracy? In less than nine years after military victory and the demise of Imperial Germany, the United States War Department was teaching the two hundred and sixty thousand young Americans under its control, as we have seen, that "the principal characteristics of democracy" are "demagogism, license, impulse, agitation, discontent, anarchy, chaos, and socialism." Nothing less than all of these!

But the Endowment was sure of itself. If anyone wishes to know how generously it entered into the spirit of the War, let him examine the Year Book of the organization for 1918, particularly under the section on "War Activities of Trustees and Personnel."

In red ink all the Endowment's stationery was headed "Peace through Victory." And to cap the climax its offices at 2 Jackson Place in Washington were turned over for occupancy to the Committee on Public (so-called) Information.

It was also generous with funds. For the year 1917 it contributed to the New York Peace Society, $6000 out of the latter's total budget of $9204.72, and $4000 more was given for the year ending in June 1918. The New York Peace Society had faithfully supported the War. To the American Peace Society for the previous year went $25,000, amounting to 70 per cent of its total receipts, and for the year ending 1918 it granted $20,000. The American Peace Society had faithfully supported the War.

It was in 1914 that the Church Peace Union was founded, with a gift from Carnegie of $2,000,000. It proceeded to form the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches. Both the Union and the World Alliance faithfully supported the War.

No less than $2,792,500 was given by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, a body distinct from the Endowment

for Peace, holding $125,000,000 as war grants.[31] The Red Cross received $1,500,000. Library buildings for camps were erected, thirty-two in number, at a cost of $320,000. The Knights of Columbus got $250,000 and the Y.M.C.A. a similar amount. The National Reserve Council was awarded $150,000, while $100,000 went to the Y.W.C.A., $50,000 to the War Camp Community Recreation Service, and $22,500 to the National Board of Medical Examiners.

Last but not least of the war grants was $150,000 to the National Security League, prime foe of pacifism, proponent of military training, and champion of large military and naval establishments. Incidentally, though not as a war grant, an unnamed sum is listed as having gone to the National Civic Federation, a defensive outpost against union labor, the "youth movement," and all species of radicals, liberals and conservative advocates of disarmament.

The Peace Endowment also could afford generosity; the original gift from Carnegie was in the form of first mortgage bonds of the United States Steel Corporation totaling $11,500,000; and the War boosted U. S. Steel enormously, its profits jumping from $143,000,000 in 1914 to $532,000,000 in 1919.

Looking at the practical peace results achieved by such bestowals of money, one is almost moved to ask a question:

> How firm a Foundation, ye saints of the Lord,
> Is laid for your faith in his excellent word?

It was not a pacifist but an army officer who in 1923 published a penetrating criticism of the peace movement, from radicals to staunch conservatives. In regard to our point here he said:

> One great peace society, on receiving its endowment, drew up for itself an agenda of work and wrote into the first item of that agenda the "thorough and scientific investigation and study of the causes of war." This work was assigned to a department of the society devoted to economics and history, and counting among its members statesmen, historians and economists, as well as professors of the following universities: Columbia, Wisconsin, London, Oxford, Liverpool, Glasgow, Paris, Ghent, Vienna,

Turin, Pisa, Copenhagen, Stockholm, Leyden, Geneva and Kioto. During the past eleven years this department expended well over half a million dollars. In short men and means have both been employed.

Ten books and twenty-four pamphlets have been published by this department, the result of its eleven years' work. But all the pamphlets are *Preliminary Studies of the War* (1914-1918). They do not concern themselves with the causes of that war or any other. Some of their titles are: *Financial History of Great Britain,* 1914-18; *British War Administration; Influence of the Great War upon Shipping; War Thrift; British Labor Conditions and Legislation During the War; Negro Migration During the War; Government War Contracts.* Nine of the ten books published deal with the general subjects of industry, commerce and finance, with casualties in war and military pensions, with existing tariff policies and with conscription in Japan; but none of these subjects are studied as possible causes of war—obviously several of them are effects of war. Only one of the ten books faintly suggests a study of the causes of war. It was written by "A Diplomatist," and turns out to be an essay on two minor Balkan wars.

When one considers all the blood that has been shed in war and all that has been written and said about it, it seems strange indeed that the germ-essence of the thing should boil down to that one anonymous volume, recounting the dull stories of two almost forgotten wars. And as for the economic studies, the one thing about them that strikes a soldier is that they throw no light on the causes or prevention of war, but that they would be most useful guides to any government *while waging war.*[32]

The personal accomplishments of those charged with policies in the great foundations have been frequently far more significant. It must also be borne in mind that if war is to be eliminated, we have got to know all about war. But when the post-War *peace* studies are stood up against the more than one hundred volumes already published by the Endowment, for example, on the history of the World War alone, the disproportion is startling. Of course the War was vast and we must understand it in detail. Possibly the peace foundations must do the work and not entrust it to the government's departments. But allowing for all this and the advances made since the writing of this criticism, it is hard to escape the conclusion that be-

tween promise and performance, as between ideals and tactics, lies a vast abyss.

After the War

When the fighting ceased, what had it brought? It is an easy trap for the unwary which is set by Father Time, for, looking back on past events, it always seems as though they could not have been otherwise. That is to say, every happening acts as an attorney pleading the case of what has gone before it. Looking that way at the War, it would be possible to say that at least a rudimentary peace-league of nations was crystallized, a few nationalities freed from unwelcome control, a new world outlook fostered.

But all the pacifist has to ask is this: Was the accomplishment worth the price; could the incidental values not have been better won by better means? By such a test it would be rash to answer in any way other than suggested by Ramsay MacDonald, let us say, who in England hardly backed the War, and by Dr. Frederick Lynch, who in this country did.

Said Mr. MacDonald:

> The war failed lamentably, as it was bound to fail, in settling moral issues and changing the spirit of humanity. It has not established democracy nor a spirit of democracy, but has left a confidence in dictatorship and force and an impatience with ordered progress and national good feeling.[33]

Said Dr. Lynch:

> Our people—government and all—were shouting wonderful things that were going to come to pass as the result of this war. It was a war to end war. It was to make the world safe for democracy. It was to make a new world order where Christian principles were to reign among nations. There is no denying that we are in a disappointed world—a world which looks back upon the men who were at Paris as betrayers of their words and promises. We got no world safe for democracy, no new world order, no Christian era of international good-will.[34]

We did, however, get one thing: a peace movement more realistic, less romantically satisfied with trifles, more in the

hands of younger leadership, more imbued with a salutary skepticism of easy "royal roads" and panaceas. The Foreign Policy Association has distinguished itself by its fact-finding and educational services, and the National Council for Prevention of War has performed many a significant work at the Capital. The War Resisters' League and some of the women's groups already mentioned have kept alive the central theme of the radical opposition to war, and the Fellowship of Reconciliation has brought the vitalizing influence of a meaningful religion to bear on a way of life in which war can exact no tribute. In many organizations not specifically peace societies, such as the Y.M. and Y.W.C.A., the Y.M. and Y.W.H.A., the realistic note has been increasingly evident in their consideration of war.

There is more realism, yes; but we are by no means free from the ancient weaknesses, the tendency to go around the old-time circular paths that lead to nowhere.

There is hardly need to call the roll of these ever-present fallacies. They are all about us. As after every other war, we have our hosts of honest veterans, many of them banded into the American Legion, which in the preamble to its constitution declares for "a one hundred per cent Americanism." We have a vestigial American Peace Society fearful of all radicals, urging "adequate" defense, patted on the back by leading advocates of a big navy and imperialism, and hailed enthusiastically in the public prints by army men.[35] In numerous places the spokesmen of peace societies, in the face of titanic armaments and almost universal international tension, appear convinced that "the peace makers are entering into their heritage." Not now the steamship or the railroad, but the radio, is "drawing the nations of the earth together in peaceful pursuits."

Our journey has been long. We have met some sturdy personalities; we have tasted pettiness and heroism; we have looked upon scenes pleasurable and otherwise; we have assessed the play of giant forces and the essential traits of a movement which have made it a minor conqueror and a major casualty.

And now? To what way shall we turn for future action?

CHAPTER XX

THE PERENNIAL QUEST FOR UNITY

Science is strong and powerful because scientists divide their labors, because the works of scientists are cast in such a form as to be communicable to other investigators with minimum loss, and because scientists entirely as a matter of course pour their labors into the common fund.—JOHN STORCK, *Man and Civilization* (Columbia University Press).

CHAPTER XX

THE PERENNIAL QUEST FOR UNITY

ALWAYS the peace movement has sought for unity within its ranks. Seldom has the movement found it.

In this regard it has fared no differently from organized religion, the world of art, trade unionism, or any other realm of human endeavor. Even science has had its bitter schisms, its feuds, its heretics and martyrs.

Yet there have always been those who deplored divisionism in the peace movement, who appealed to its sections for increased harmony and union.

The Massachusetts Peace Society almost in the beginning tried to coördinate the work of the ten local societies that soon grew up. The American Peace Society sprang from the same desire. Yet, as we have seen, no far-reaching unity seemed attainable. The New York Peace Society had breaks in the ranks; and so did practically all the others. The American Peace Society could not avert the waves of inner struggle that surged up and broke the bonds of union.

Among the strongest voices calling for unity was that of George C. Beckwith! A short time before the series of events which, largely due to him, were to culminate in one of the peace movement's worst splits, he issued a tract entitled *Union in Peace.* "Union is indispensable to every cause," he said, "but to none more so than to the cause of peace." He pointed out the obvious difficulty, which "arises mostly from the diversity of views among its friends."

> The cause of peace, then, ought to be prosecuted with the same liberality as other enterprises, and all its friends be permitted, without rebuke or suspicion, to promote it in such ways as they respectively prefer. The test should be, not the belief of this or

that dogma, but a willingness to co-operate for the entire abolition of war; and all that will do this, and just as far as they do it, should be regarded as friends of peace. . . .

Such a course would, likewise, obviate many causes of jealousy and collision among the friends of peace. All their strength ought to be spent against their common foe; but no small part of their time and energies has hitherto been wasted in disputes among themselves on points not essential to their object.

Now this was very appealing and plausible. The trouble was, many in the peace movement were by no means working for the "entire abolition of war." There were further troubles, which we may as well consider later. Whether all those who cry "peace, peace" were working toward peace, has been somewhat thoroughly indicated by this study. And whether the time spent in discussion and controversy has been wasted is a field for additional inquiry.

Not to labor the point, we may jump to 1911, when we find President William Howard Taft addressing the Third American Peace Congress at Baltimore:

You have a Congress here, and in this Congress I assume that a good many associations take part. Have you any basis of organization and union which unites your efforts in anything but this Congress? Don't you think you had better unite your peace associations and make your efforts united toward the one object you have in view? Aren't you likely to squander a little of your force if you maintain isolated associations and do not come together for the purpose we all have in view?

Again, skipping to 1927, we discover a peace journal asserting:

Unification of the plans and programmes of all agencies for Peace would be most desirable and would furnish a starting-point for a mass movement of far-reaching effect. Why can not the authorized representatives of the various agencies and societies meet in general conference and formulate plans for education and for the preparation and distribution of propaganda in such manner that all will work in harmony? and thus the possibilities of jealousy, criticism and friction be eliminated as nearly as possible in any human endeavor.[1]

In all of the multitudinous calls for union there has been

much justification. From the very beginning of the organized peace effort, sharp differences of opinion on methods have been manifest. Periodically there has been rather good cooperation, and after all is said regarding schisms, the fact is undeniable that the peace movement has probably developed more coöperative personalities than most other movements—possibly more than any other. Yet jealousy, bickering, narrowness have not been wanting.

For all of such petty exhibitions there can be no excuse, no excuse whatever. Against the peace societies in such circumstances should be turned all the merciless castigation of its foes, for it is richly merited. There are reasons, of course, for taut nerves and high-strung temperaments in any movement which has to work uphill against intrenched tradition. Most leaders of peace work have labored non-union hours, under all kinds of strain and sacrifice. But so far as childish displays of unlovely personal characteristics are concerned, reason or no reason, they must be scotched and given no quarter.

Hardly less patience can be expected from those outside the movement with the numerous advocates of panaceas. The number of these salesmen of sole ideas has always been legion and is to-day. These are the ones who would stall off the wolves of war by war-proof fencing—a fence consisting of a single picket.

Land monopoly, say single-taxers, is the basic cause of war; establish a sane and equitable taxation to free the land for the people, and war will be no more. But when land was cheapest in this country, the War Hawks set their hearts on land in Canada.

Birth control throughout the world, say neo-Malthusianists, will relieve population pressure and remove the threat of conflict. Yet France with a conspicuously low birthrate has been far from least combative of the nations, whereas China with a high birthrate has been comparatively pacific for thousands of years.

Free trade, say foes of tariffs, will build up commerce and establish mutual trust and banish war. Yet England, largely a

free-trade country for many years, has been at war as much as any other.

If we can build up a world auxiliary language, say Esperantists and advocates of Ido, we shall have an irresistible peace instrument. But in countries suffering terrible revolutions, the use of a common tongue appears to have been a poor preventive.

By Anglo-Saxon solidarity, say our Anglophiles (to the outrage of Humanophiles), the world can be kept perpetually at peace; yet we have fought Great Britain twice and have been on critical terms several times.

International sport, assert sportsmen, will break down misunderstanding and provincialism among the masses, and preserve a friendly competition inimical to war. But somehow sportsmen are conspicuously uninterested in peace work as a whole and sportsmen's associations have always been among the most eager supporters of wars when they have occurred.

We have previously examined the notion that capitalism is a sole cause of war and the "human nature" causation theory. Akin to these extravagances of emphasis is Professor William MacDougall's contention that "the problem of war and peace is wholly a psychological problem." [2]

It irks me to confess that many a radical pacifist has been overheard contending that conscientious objection alone would render war impossible; indeed it could, but alone it could not build the kind of world society which will be free from dangerous strains and stresses. For that, other approaches will be also necessary.

Let me be understood. I do not assert that all who believe in the single tax, birth control, or any of these other most excellent reforms are the preachers of "only" gospels; but in all of these various movements have been found too large a number who have put forth their programs in exclusive terms, as infallible nostrums, needless of supplement.

So far does this tendency go that a prominent and widely traveled woman recently announced her conviction that jazz will make the whole world kin. "Saxophones," she asserts,

"are doing more to bring about the brotherhood of man than Leagues of Nations, World Courts, Internationalism, or billion dollar loans." If she speaks truth, there may be only new recruits to the war method, for many in the new international order will retire to sound-proof chambers, and while war desolates the earth, ask sourly in the words if not the manner of Mr. Irving Berlin, "What Does It Matter?"

But among the majority, who are not monogamously wedded to one idea, there are quite legitimate and ponderable reasons for reluctance when it comes to steps toward a closer unity in work for peace. Those reasons center chiefly in a universal factor of all social progress.

In practice the only platform on which unity can be had is the program of the most conservative coöperating element.

The radical, who is willing to pay a higher price for peace, to run more risks for peace, to effect more drastic social changes for peace, is able and willing as a rule to coöperate with the conservative peace advocate on concrete projects, though these may fall below his heart's desire. He realizes that these plans are essential steps in a long process, and provided they go indeed in the right direction, he is willing to lend them his support for what it may be worth. If anyone is skeptical on this point, a study of the movement's history will reassure him. David Low Dodge was a director and contributor of the American Peace Society for over a score of years. Elihu Burritt, despite the resignation forced on him by the taunts of Beckwith and the retrogression of principles, did not sever his connection entirely, and for the last thirty years of his life maintained a cooperative attitude toward the less far-reaching objectives of the American Peace Society. It was the same with Joshua P. Blanchard and with Alfred Love, and is the same with the radical pacifist societies and individuals of to-day.

In fact, if radicals in the peace movement are to be criticized at all for their attitude toward schemes backed by the conservatives, they deserve censure for their frequent subordination of their own distinctive and invaluable programs to temporary and less meaningful projects.

Almost uniformly have the radicals supported campaigns for the World Court, for arms limitation, for one or another maneuver in the whole struggle against war.

But what of the conservatives? How far have the foundations, the endowments, the League of Nations promoters, the World Court advocates, for example, coöperated for the advancement, say, of war resistance? Of course—this is far too much to expect.

Too much to expect it certainly is. But in this situation lies the whole problem of unity or the lack of it. When the agencies that exist ostensibly for the diffusion of peace literature for educational purposes usually steer away from pacifist writings as if they were contaminated; while spokesmen of the conservative organizations use pacifism as something they can disavow at the beginning of a public address in order to achieve a welcome from reactionaries for their remarks; so long as conservative compilations omit reference (as many of them do) to the material issued by radical agencies while the latter characteristically include in their citations and distributions the product of conservative peace groups—how is extensive unity conceivable?

It would be a fruitless task, however, to suggest a *modus operandi* whereby a variety of peace organizations from "left" to "right" might unite in a common endeavor. They have united, they can unite, and they will continue to unite, in backing short-term crusades on conservative lines, and for definite objects not more thoroughgoing than the conservatism of the most conservative will tolerate. Anything further than this is beyond the bounds of probability.

A balance can be restored if all radical peace groups will measure their resources in funds, members, and work-intensity, and conserve the bulk of their strength for their own radical objectives. They are needed for that work, and desperately needed. A few cruisers more or less, a slightly different wording in our official attitude to the World Court, are of vastly less import to posterity than the imperishable legacy of a virile pacifist philosophy and the development of a pacifist technique for concrete conflict situations.

Among all groups which are fairly close together in principle, whether radical or conservative, there should be the highest degree of unity. The more difficult radicals and conservatives find it to work in close coöperation, the more they should coöperate where the limitations of their honest convictions will permit them. At very few times in the history of the peace movement over the last fifty years would it not have been possible to work out a closer affiliation among the more radical bodies, and equally among the more conservative. The meager resources of the radicals make it all the more imperative that they, in particular, combine and merge and coöperate in every case where an array of overwhelmingly urgent reasons does not justify continued separation.

However these words may sound to the countless sincere conservatives in the peace movement, it is necessary to speak plainly. As this survey of the movement's experience abundantly shows, there are many in it who publicly proclaim their adherence to methods which in the past have led not to peace but to war.

The greatest danger of war, so far as this country is concerned, lies not alone, perhaps not mainly, in openly militaristic opinion, but in the men and women of good will whose idealism is not appreciably tinctured with realism—the people who will support such wars as can be made by their proponents to seem crusades for noble ends. These are the people who constitute the bulk of the peace movement as a whole.

For that reason the radical, realistic societies and individuals hold a mandate from the future to labor unremittingly at their unique and indispensable tasks, putting first things first, and uniting on other programs only to an extent which will mean no diminution of their energy. They can, however, continue to place before their members the literature and the viewpoints of the conservative organizations; they can maintain an attitude of open-mindedness; and they can assist the process through which society moves onward, by evaluating fairly every criticism of radical tactics proffered by less radical workers for peace.

In closing this discussion, it is important to remind all

readers that there is far more coöperation in the peace movement of to-day than one might suppose who was not intimate with its various branches and its various undertakings. Such an organization as the National Council for Prevention of War shows that a high degree of coöperative effort is possible; and even among societies which maintain no affiliations there is frequent conference and common counsel. The charge so often voiced by opponents of the peace societies that they are all run by "interlocking directorates" has, happily, a modicum of justification.

There is a fairly widespread recognition of the value derived from different views, and a disposition to avoid duplication of effort. If our juvenile understanding of coöperative processes matures and our respect for the hard facts of our specific world problems becomes increasingly sturdier, the movement will doubtless be able to achieve all the unity it is well for it to have. Something of the spirit of science, a combined criticism and coöperation, may develop and contribute not only to greater accuracy of statement but to the *esprit de corps* which every forward-looking movement has to have.

And let no one forget that the matter of unity is only, after all, one phase of the fight for peace. Of infinitely more importance is the question, which is the sound approach to a warless world? The unfriendly critic of the peace movement may nevertheless be excused for his insistence that what we cannot work out in the clash of honest differences of opinion can scarcely be worked out among the diversified and "opinionated" nations on the quarrelsome earth.

CHAPTER XXI

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE RADICALS

It is by no means to be inferred that everyone who sets himself at war with the traditional mores is a hero of social correction and amelioration. The trained reason and conscience never have heavier tasks laid upon them than where questions of conformity to, or dissent from, the mores are raised.—WILLIAM GRAHAM SUMNER, *Folkways* (Ginn and Co.).

CHAPTER XXI

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE RADICALS

If every vision were a prophecy, if every innovator were a seer, what a simple matter would social progress be! Every herald of the millennium would be safe to follow; and mankind could race through a dizzy cosmos to a speedy consummation of its unknown destiny.

Unfortunately, the parents of new ideas can never be trusted to give unbiased judgments on their offspring. A stout pride and confidence in the youngster's virtue may be all to the good. But there is danger from too much coddling, and a blind admiration may lead to a variety of parental excesses.

Few indeed are the partisans who have been able to contend earnestly for a cause and at the same time keep a critical eye upon their own endeavors. Not to do so only means, of course, an unnecessary retardation in their true advance. No radical in any cause should flinch from suspicion, hostility, or even hatred aroused by his faithful advocacy of unpopular ideas. But as Professor Sumner long ago made clear, and as new evidence increasingly emphasizes, the innovator in particular ought to test his viewpoints continually, explore his mental baggage with a cold and fishy eye to seek out fallacies, unsound methods, exaggerations, outworn ideology, gone-to-seed traditions, and other impedimenta.

Throughout this book errors and weaknesses of conservatives in the peace movement have been plainly, though not unsympathetically, stated. The radicals have not received unqualified praise. There are some special difficulties the radicals have placed in their own way. If the conservatives have not endorsed the radical view, in some measure the radicals can blame nobody

but themselves. For much of their own failure to carry weight with the majority, the responsibility is their own.

The radical can no more escape from his environment than the conservative. However his spirit may soar, to some degree his feet are earthbound. The most ardent opponent of private ownership, to make his socialist speech in a far city, has to travel on privately owned trains. No man can entirely extricate himself from the community of which he is a part. The religious zealots of olden times who withdrew from the evils of this world and sat out their days on solitary towers only proved, by approximating Thoreau's epigram, that if you make a handier feast than any other man, the insect world will soon make a path to your abode.

The radical pacifists in the peace movement were not unsocial beings; they were active, energetic participators in the events of their times. They were subject to the influences, the tempo, the mood of the period in which they lived. They can hardly be blamed if to their surroundings they capitulated more than they knew, if they were after all trying to set sail for far lands with anchor still unhoisted.

The Drag of Illiberal Religion

Their religion was often an anchor when it should have been a keel. It was the function of their faith in God and man to hold them firm and steady amid the wildest hurricanes. It was not the function of that faith to be a drag on their brave adventure. Yet such, at times, it was. And because to-day the movement of modern pacifism is at some points similarly burdened and similarly held back from a wider acceptance by numerous intelligent and high-minded people of sensitive social conscience, we must consider frankly the religious attitudes of pacifism which have been unduly emphasized.

The first of these attitudes was a sort of millennial literalism. Samuel Whelpley, in 1818, believed the abolition of war inevitable, "especially when I consider that the reign of the Prince of Peace throughout the earth cannot be far distant." "If in the comparatively short run of two centuries," he said,

"the Millennium shall have been fully ushered in, and you well know that all calculation founded on prophecy falls within that limit, are we not authorized to believe that new and great events will tread, as it were, on the heels of each other?" [1]

In 1834 *The Calumet* complained because

> . . . our newspapers, and particularly our religious periodicals, have not opposed a war with France, as they should oppose all war, on Christian principles. A war would consign thousands of souls to endless perdition, that, without it, might enjoy eternal happiness, and who shall say that five millions of dollars, or any other earthly good, is to be put in comparison with an immortal soul? [2]

But hell fire seemed to many people a poor argument against war; for they could not reconcile a God of love with such vindictiveness. They kept the idea of vengeance or modified the idea of God's love; but they were not won by such an argument to the pacifist ideal.

One of the favorite pacifist charges against war was that it led to Sabbath-breaking. David Low Dodge, with facts enough of course to support him, lamented because "War occasions a great profanation of the Sabbath." William Ladd declared that "every thing of a warlike nature seems to take pride in violating the Sabbath. Where do you hear the boatswain's call in the harbor, on the Sabbath, except on board a man of war?" The St. Louis *Observer* in 1834 ran an article, which was used widely by the peace groups, showing that the habits of Sabbath-breaking acquired in war persist in times of peace. But again, good people who were at all convinced regarding the necessity of any war at all were hardly impressed with the fact that it broke the Sabbath. To them it seemed much like arguing against capital punishment on the ground that it kept the hangman occupied for a time when otherwise he might be at his prayers.

Not only the Puritan idea of the Sabbath but the Puritan idea of recreation was offended by the young men in the army and the militia camps. There were reasons for complaint; but the good and the harmless seemed inextricably mixed. Ladd

and others quoted a writer who, in *The Christian Mirror,* had sharply protested, all in the same breath, the camp life which was characterized by "the tottering steps of the drunkard," the sale of obscene pictures, the "horribly profane language," the "suffocating fumes of tobacco-smoke," vulgar dancing to "the disgusting scrapings of some old fiddle," and "the nine-pin alley."

Many of the old-time pacifists would have objected to any weakening of faith in God's power to intervene in human affairs, through a discussion of non-violent resistance in sociological terms. Trying to visualize a whole pacifist people attacked by a hostile invader, the pacifists of 1833 had a ready answer:

> How easily might it be frustrated by providential interference, without any deviation from the ordinary laws of nature; as by influencing the minds of the leaders, by dispersing the armament in a tempest, or disabling it by sickness.[3]

One group utterance went so far as to say explicitly:

> It is indeed to be regretted, that no instance of a *strictly* national character has yet occurred, to test the practicability of the principle for which we plead,—an unreasoning reliance upon the Omnipotent Arm for protection and defence.[4]

Even to-day large sections of the pacifist movement the world around base much of their pacifism on this same providential security. *The Arm of God* is the title of a striking little book which cites what their authors believed were examples of this very kind of intervention. I do not desire to enter the field of religious or metaphysical controversy; it may well be that individuals of mystical exaltation will find in such experiences sufficient evidence of the validity of pacifism.

I submit, however, that it is an inadequate basis for pacifism itself or for the consideration of a non-pacifist who may be undertaking to evaluate pacifist methods. The march of knowledge may not more and more discredit these "case studies"; but it will expose them to a ruthless scrutiny and will increasingly—of this I feel certain—demand evidence more in the nature of

less extreme special incidents and more in the realm of everyday social principles.

Another emphasis I discuss with reluctance lest I be misunderstood. From the very first assertion of pacifism by the primitive Christians, the minority groups which have kept pacifism alive through the Dark and Middle Ages, through the organized peace movement and into the present time, have leaned strongly on the example of these early followers of Jesus. In that habit I have joined and will doubtless join on many future occasions. With good reason the pacifists have quoted the words and deeds of the anti-military Christian martyrs. Had their record been one of militarism or even of consistent compromise with war, the essential spirit of the great Nazarene would seem far less potent than it now does.

Yet unless the whole basis of pacifism is to be centered exclusively in an authoritarian conception of Jesus—something I can never think he would desire—it will not do to rest the case too heavily upon the early Christians. Assuredly the principles of pacifism are just as valid when employed by non-Christians as by those who have professed a formal allegiance to Jesus.

But neither non-Christians nor Christian liberals can forget that in not a few respects the early Christians were poor guides. Religiously they still approached the abnormal emotional ecstasy of the "mysteries," those strange cults which died but slowly, so far as their psychic aspect was concerned, even under the impact of the new religion from little Palestine. Intellectually they were by no means in the hands of learned men or always profound thinkers. Their type of pacifism was rooted largely in a withdrawal from community activities of every kind; they were "non-participators" even more than "non-resistants"; they renounced "the world." The Apostle James insisted that friendship of the world was enmity against God.

"The prohibition of all slavery," says Lecky, "which was one of the peculiarities of the Jewish Essenes, and the illegitimacy of hereditary slavery, which was one of the speculations of the Stoic Dion Chrysostum, had no place in the ecclesiastical teaching. Slavery was distinctly and formally recognized

by Christianity, and no religion ever laboured more to encourage a habit of *docility* and *passive* obedience." [5] We must take issue with Lecky to some extent; for the daring militancy of the early Christians was hardly "passive obedience." But outside of a few humanitarian modifications, they accepted slavery substantially as it was in the Roman world. And indeed in all of their thought, submissiveness was a substantial factor.

They believed in demons. Said Origen, "It is demons which produce famine, unfruitfulness, corruptions of the air, pestilences." They appeared able to reconcile toleration of scandalous social institutions with the ideal and practice of an exacting personal asceticism.

In view of the mixed heritage from the early church, consisting of splendid heroism and acquiescence in systematized injustice, of noble spiritual achievement and superstitious ignorance, these early seekers after a better way of life ought not to be relied on unreservedly as an example for present-day pacifism. We may pay them homage for their great historic rôle; but as models for imitation they can hardly serve. When President Allen caused such a commotion by his "defense of defensive war" in 1834, he might have been more moved had William Ladd not pressed so strongly on that point. He compels the sympathy even of a pacifist. Said he:

> On the whole, therefore, we could wish that the question of the lawfulness of Defensive War, might be discussed and determined, on its own merits, without an appeal to ecclesiastical antiquity. With the sacred volume in our hands we are surely as capable as our fathers, of ascertaining the grand points of Christian duty. . . .[6]

As evidence regarding Jesus, the fathers are vitally important. Yet even here they must be followed with a candid caution.

Even on Jesus himself pacifism must not lean too heavily. Without the essentials of his meager story, how barren would be history! He is a unique teacher in the art of love. We can never cite his example or his teaching too much, unless we

stop with his simple principles themselves and fail to develop them to fit our present complicated situations. A number of pacifist sects have wholly failed in this respect, and the religious pacifist movement as a whole has far too largely failed.

The similarity between the world in which Jesus lived and our own situation is greater than may be supposed offhand. But modern pacifists are probably inclined to underestimate the vast differences that exist between the current ways of thought and the mode of thought out of which grew the ideology of the beloved Galilean. Jesus was a pacifist; but a somewhat different pacifist from the pacifist he would be to-day and what the modern pacifist must be. It is not that we need change his pacifism; only that we must translate his pacifism; only that we must translate it into terms of social science and use it as the basis of an art of life. It is not that we need circumscribe his unique principles; only that we must not allow the religious approach to them to circumscribe us as we seek to let them grow.

In his excellent book on *Non-Violent Coercion,* Clarence Marsh Case refers to Jesus as a passive resistant. The term is far from adequate, for "passive" Jesus certainly was not. But nevertheless, overlooking the inexact word, Professor Case expresses what every unbiased investigator must feel:

> If one were to overlook Jesus of Nazareth as the one supreme exemplar of the victorious power of passive resistance, his case would be precisely analogous to that of the early students of nature, who had great difficulty in detecting the *atmosphere* simply because of its universal presence and its equal and never-failing pressure.

The Myth of Non-Resistance

"Non-resistance" is a term which has profoundly stirred some of the world's finest humans. It has been used in thousands of articles, pamphlets, books and addresses. To call it a myth may therefore seem preposterous. But let us see.

A myth we may call something which has no existence in fact. Is there such a thing as non-resistance? Perhaps there is; but none of its advocates have practiced it.

"Resist not evil," said Paul—and added, "but overcome evil with good." "Overcome" is a term of conquest, implying an assertion of a positive influence. The meaning is indisputable: Jesus and his followers had no idea that a mere personal goodness, unasserted, could cope with evil; goodness, positively embodied in action, even sinless anger, carried the banners of a conqueror.

Tolstoy, who in theory possibly preached a more consistent non-resistance than Jesus, never in his life approximated non-resistance. Energetically he resisted militarism and its works, with a sturdily aggressive temper.

Lao-tse, who urged "calm and repose" not victory "by force of arms," and who taught that "the kingdom is a spirit-like thing and cannot be got by active doing," was perhaps as near to non-resistance as anyone has ever been; but Lao-tse also preached "production without possession, action without aggression." The gaps are less wide than may casually be thought between his philosophy of non-action, Gautama's renunciation and harmlessness, and the Nazarene Jew's insistence on the conquering power of love. Lao-tse, Buddha, Jesus, the early Christians, the Bohemian Brethren, the Mennonites, the Shwenkfelders, the Dunkards, the Shakers, the Friends —with all of these resistance to wrong has been a characteristic.

Almost uniformly, of course, that resistance has been free from violence. Moral force, persuasion, dramatic appeals to public opinion, martyrdom—all these means of resistance have been used. Often along with them or independently victories have been won or defeats have been nobly endured by sheer sacrificial good will.

Even examining the word abstractly, non-resistance is an impossibility. A silence may be as insulting as a "bad name"; or it may be accepted, rightly or wrongly, as acquiescence, even approval. There are no concrete situations in this life where a person may be suspended midway between two opposing forces; that kind of levitation is as suspect as the conjuror's. Inaction, no less than action, is a social factor and wields an

influence inevitably. In moving affairs, especially in highly mechanized society, there is no truth in the contemplative aphorism of Lao-tse: "Who is there can make muddy water clear? Yet let it but be still, and it will gradually become clear." We know that it would turn at last into a stagnant mess, teeming with invisible bacteria; its apparent clarity is a fatal deception. Resist or not resist—whichever we do we affect the course of events.

The professed non-resistant will have grown tired long since of all this meticulous speculation. He will promptly adduce evidence to prove that non-resistance has never been observed or even conceived of in a literal sense. Indeed he could bring to court any piece of non-resistant literature at all and make an excellent case. The fact is that from the earliest use of the term to our own day it has required a continuous explanation. It has had to travel always paired by a body of apologetics, much in the manner of some who have taken holy vows. Almost never has a "non-resistant" been able to open his mouth, dip his quill, or smite his typewriter without consuming invaluable time in a series of qualifications.

William Lloyd Garrison once tried to set a critic right:

> Our correspondent is greatly in error in speaking of non-resistance as a state of "passivity." On the contrary, it is a state of activity, ever fighting the good fight of faith, ever foremost to assail unjust power, ever struggling for "liberty, equality, fraternity," in no national sense, but in a world-wide spirit. It is passive only in this sense,—that it will not return evil for evil, nor give blow for blow, nor resort to murderous weapons for protection or defense. In its purity, it is the blending of the gentleness and innocency of the Lamb of God, with the courage and strength of the Lion of the tribe of Judah.[7]

So far as this interpretation pertains to resistance at all, it speaks only for resistance without violence. In point of fact Garrison's conception of it—which is the same as that of modern "non-resistants"—departs from resistance and enters the field of initiated action, undertaken *first* to accomplish an objective. Here the resistance, of whatever sort, must be

exerted by the other side—that is, by the resisters against non-resistance!

Adin Ballou wrote a whole book for the same reason which led Garrison to explain the word. Ernest Howard Crosby labored faithfully for many years to make its meaning plain: John Haynes Holmes, admitting that the term is a travesty, tried his best to make it understandable in thirty brilliant pages of his *New Wars for Old.*

But what are we to do? Go through another century using a title for a whole approach to life which inherently militates against its acceptance, often because people cannot understand it without an elaborate explanation? Perhaps we can; but if we do, by the end of another hundred years there may be so few who will openly align themselves with such a nondescript anomaly that the old word will be buried in the Potter's Field of destitute expressions.

Why not bury it now, decently and in order, with affectionate farewells? Because, of course, something is wanted to fill its place. We would proclaim "the king is dead," if we could also cry "long live the king."

Substitutes are already being sought; increasingly, especially among the younger groups in the radical peace movement, "super-resistance" is being used. Beyond a certain cultish sound, the term is better, so far as actual resistance is involved. But it leaves wholly untouched the great field of non-violent assertion, in which the struggle is initiated and carried to the opposition.

We shall not get far by trying to invent a slogan or a phrase. Nor is a completely adequate term ready to our hands. Never mind the dictionary. We can make the lexicographers do our bidding if we establish a real usage.

Why not be more specific? Why not use language that precisely outlines what is meant? It is the story of all new arts or sciences that they proceed from a simple and generalized vocabulary to more complex and exact expressions. Social movements may do likewise. The time has come for the pacifist movement to know what it is talking about.

Pacifism, which once meant the whole peace movement, has for fifteen years been almost universally delimited to cover the radical anti-war section of the movement, which is committed not against war in general but against all wars in particular. In expressing their abhorrence, in denying the radicals on every critical occasion, the conservatives have performed a worthy service and given us a handy category. Pacifism is a word capable of containing every positive and constructive element of radical peace endeavor as well as its intolerance of the war method. So pacifism let it be, inscribed on the pennant behind which modern pacifists rally.

But pacifists are not entirely alike. They have their differing views. Nor is pacifism so simple as to comprehend only one type of non-violent activity. Therefore we may as well depart from a general terminology and separate into as many definite categories as we need.

We shall want to exercise, according to the specific situation, non-violent resistance—the folded arms.

We shall use good will resistance—conquest by sacrifice.

We shall use non-violent insistence—determined, unsurrendering protest.

We shall use, it may be, non-violent attack—the waging of a hateless contest for social progress, on our own initiative, in the adversary's camp.

We shall use, perhaps, non-violent coercion—obedience compelled by "soul-force," as Gandhi calls it, or by the boycott, the strike, non-coöperation, or civil disobedience.

We shall use—who knows? But try to cover all these tremendously varied activities under so limited, so false, so mythical a term as non-resistance, we shall no more.

One further effect of using a blurry terminology is the popular misunderstanding of the various attitudes toward force. Most people, beyond question, lump together the advocacy of "passive resistance," "pacifism," "non-resistance," even the marginal "passive obedience."

Pacifists are united in their preoccupation with a way of positive life which has no place for war. In respect to the use

of force they differ greatly. The employment of war is proscribed by all of them, and they will neither take part in it nor give it their sanction.

Within this area of agreement there are varying schools of thought. By far the great majority, probably, refuse to concede that there is any analogy between the use of physical force in war and the use of physical force by an individual or by *bona fide* police. In various degrees, according to circumstances, they would freely sanction the latter use of force to restrain dangerous persons.

War they cannot support, because in war the guilty usually go unscathed and the innocent are made to suffer; however great may be the excesses of police, they seldom go so far as to wreak vengeance on a criminal by dropping poison gas or bombs upon his innocent relatives—yet that is war exactly. Besides, war does not really protect or defend.

In 1834 the Reverend C. S. Henry, addressing the Windham County Peace Society, expressed the same sort of sentiment that is so often heard to-day, and which was based on the same confusion:

> To deny absolutely, on moral grounds, the right of repelling invasion and slaughter by taking up arms, involves, necessarily, the absolute denial of the right of self defense in individual cases. . . . The answer to this, decides the question concerning the moral right of defensive war.

The truth is just the opposite. One may stoutly oppose all war and believe in the use of individual violence under a variety of conditions, without the slightest inconsistency. John Haynes Holmes, himself an advocate of Tolstoy's views on abstention from individual violence, has broadmindedly stated the distinction: "What we have here," he says, "is the expression of two different temperaments, or types of mind."

He also says, in seeking to differentiate between the two categories, which he refers to as pacifism and non-resistance:

> The weakness of pacifism, as ordinarily understood apart from non-resistance, is its lack of any thorough-going philosophy, its divorce from religion. It fails to see that it is not war but force

or violence which is the ultimate evil in society. It does not recognize that violence, if tolerated anywhere may easily be sanctioned everywhere.[8]

Of that danger the pacifist who still holds it ethical to employ individual force or police power or coercion, say, through the restraint of an unbalanced dangerous person, or a resort to the strike or boycott, is hardly unaware. Entirely apart from temperament, he is convinced that in the Tolstoyan view resides a begging of vital questions. The Tolstoyan who refuses to restrain a violent individual *is* tolerating violence, socially considered, and often tolerating it to the point of anti-social inactivity.

Tolstoy once responded to a criticism of this kind from Adin Ballou by saying that "the great sin is to compromise in theory —to lower the ideal of Christ to make it attainable." But that, too, is not the vital issue. Not the lowering of an ideal to keep it attainable, but the maintenance of an ideal without the sacrifice of its integrity—that is the problem. And of the compromising character of withheld physical coercion, for example, in some cases, many are firmly convinced.

Gilbert Murray has brought out clearly the real bone of contention. He is not, I confess, a happy example, since he was at the same moment trying to justify war. But so far as it goes by itself alone, his experience is like that of many who hold no brief for any war:

> I was once walking with a friend and disciple of Tolstoi's in a country lane; and a little girl was running in front of us. I put to him the well-known question—"Suppose you saw a man wicked or drunk or mad, run out and attack that child. You are a big man and carry a big stick; would you not stop him and if necessary knock him down?"
>
> "No," he said; "why should I commit a sin? I would try to persuade him, I would stand in his way, I would let him kill me, but I would not strike him."
>
> Some few people will always be found, less than one in a thousand, to take this view. They will say, "Let the little girl be killed or carried off; let the wicked man commit another wickedness; I at any rate will not add to the mass of useless violence that I see all around me."

. . . Nearly every normal man will *feel* that the real sin, the real dishonor lies in allowing an abominable act to be committed under your eyes while you have the strength to prevent it.[9]

A multitude of concrete cases could readily be adduced to show that when persuasion fails, the choice lies between the use of physical force and the toleration of great wrong, of wrong so vast that if it is allowed to go unchecked it will more than counteract the good example of one who, for sake of a pure ideal, will never resort to violent restraint.

The distinction between these views is rarely made by the general non-pacifist public. Draft boards during the World War could comprehend at once the conscientious objector who was a Tolstoyan, abjuring all physical force whatsoever; but the man who ventured to hold out against the indiscriminate, futile, blundering, retaliatory system of war, which is based largely on vengeance and reprisal—that man had a hard time. Often he was held inconsistent, insincere, an egoistic fellow whose allegiance was vouchsafed neither to the dogma of patriotism nor the dogma of non-violence, but to his own cantankerous intellect. He was the worst of anarchs, so it appeared; and universally, before his military judges, he fared badly. Yet, I submit, he was a type which was often the most intelligent and the most ethical of the war-time pacifists.

From these major points of view within the pacifist ranks, extend numerous gradations, to sects which abstain from war on most irrational grounds. At one of the camps in the last war a member of one of these sects, who was of course not representative, refused to "bear arms," in accordance with the tenets of his religion, but accepted with alacrity a post in the heavy artillery. Others refused to put on the uniform because it had buttons, and though these were metal buttons, buttons had once been made of bone, and as products of animal slaughter were taboo.

Without in the least failing to recognize that in many of these groups exist fine social values, I still assert that from such types of pacifism, so susceptible to mere freakishness and utter irrationality, will not grow the keen, thoughtful, spiritu-

ally strong and scientific pacifist movement to which we look with hope and dedication.

The radicals have also generated unnecessary skepticism about their cause by too-frequent overstatements of pacifist effectiveness. Not only have they often previsaged a world occupied by individuals uniformly far more exalted than the race of man is likely to achieve in thousands of years; they have frequently overlooked the high probabilities of repeated failure for their methods. It is possible to maintain an unshakable faith in the power of good will, and at the same time concede that in numerous situations which have gone too far under the auspices of military methods, pacifism may fail.

In this regard the pacifists of our day, owing much to the newer knowledge of the mind, offend far less than their forerunners. Many pacifists see clearly that pacifist methods require great popular solidarity, great capacity for risk and sacrifice. They also see that pacifism does not need to assert its infallibility in order to demonstrate its superiority over war.

They know that even a victorious war is all but certainly doomed to failure. They know that all they need to show is that pacifism costs less in hatred, evil legacies, and war-perpetuation (and all but as certainly in loss of life), in comparison to the method which for century on century has piled up fresh evidence that it exacts too high a social price for any fancied gains. For such a statement of their case they can bring forward overwhelming evidence; and in the face of it a fair-minded skeptic is practically disarmed.

Looking at a long, hard, uphill grind of many generations yet to come before the triumph of their cause, some of the pacifists incline to a sort of otherworldliness. Even Romain Rolland comes dangerously close to such a position in his advice to some Ukrainian war resisters:

> . . . I am never worrying about the near or future success of ideals which I know to be true, healthy and sacred. The success does not concern us. We are servants of our ideals. We have only to serve them bravely and faithfully. Whether we shall be victors or vanquished this matters little. It is a joy to serve the

eternal and to sacrifice oneself for it. I do not love at all those who so ardently expect a sort of human paradise on earth, and I have no confidence in them. These are weak people who in order to act morally feel that they must be promised an early reward, either for themselves or for their own people. The reward lies in your own self—it does not come from outside. It lies in our faith, our struggles, our courage.[10]

For the unflinching adherence to a fine ideal, to keep it alive in the world for all to see and possibly admire, heavy sacrifices are justified. Yet are we crass and materialistic if we measure the value of the ideal partly by its ability to stir the imagination and the conscience of men to its approximation in social practice?

It may not matter to the individualist war resister "whether we shall be victors or vanquished." It matters incalculably, nevertheless, to the future of the human race on this spinning spheroid whether war is abolished and left behind with a host of other discarded institutions. As he contributes to this great smashing of bloodrusted bonds, so must be measured in large part the social value of the uncompromising war opponent. If he can hold out no hope of furthering that great achievement, he may still deserve and win respect; but he will always seem the spokesman of a cult, a denizen of an ivory tower, a voice crying in a sterile wilderness.

We need our living witnesses to an ideal commonwealth of man, far in Utopian futurity. We also need our living prophets of impatience, who with divine unrest hurl lances of intolerance, bright-tipped with fiery hate, against the citadel of war, that vilest of humanity's bastilles.

It is not for our souls, nor stainless right that we contend; it is for the souls of those who follow after us. It will be cause for rejoicing if we can leave them an example; but for rejoicing many times as great if we can bequeath to them a workable, truly effective control over the menace of war.

CHAPTER XXII

PEACE TACTICS FOR THE PRESENT DAY

If we would for a moment dream that we may abolish war by supplementing these historic emotions by others more beneficent, by turning into newer channels the waters which have flowed so long in these heroic ways, then we must put ourselves to it to discover and substitute ideas, to let loose other emotions, to find incentives which shall seem as strenuous, as heroic, as noble and as well worth while as those which have sustained this long struggle of warfare.—JANE ADDAMS, to the National Peace and Arbitration Congress, New York, 1907.

CHAPTER XXII

PEACE TACTICS FOR THE PRESENT DAY

The fight for peace has been primarily defensive. It had to be, in part. Backed with prestige, tradition, and all the authority of what is tantamount to a vested interest, the military juggernaut has rolled steadily on. A new accession of momentum every now and then has necessitated strenuous opposition from the peace societies.

New naval bills, new militia bills, new encroachments of the war machine upon the areas of neutral public opinion have compelled the peace forces to drop their constructive plans and to concentrate all their energy in resistance. The United States Senate alone, long the citadel of narrow nationalism and the pampered "yes-man" of Mars, has required the attention of pacific bodies but for whose defensive campaigns in the past this country would be a far more militaristic power than it is.

Not only to oppose preparedness campaigns and political kow-towing to the demands of navalists and army patrioteers, but to prevent if possible the development of war scares into war-mad popular opinion, has been a perennial problem of the peace groups. Again and again at the instigation of bellicose minorities our government has maneuvered the ship of state into seething waters. For the avoidance of actual conflict in these cases the peace societies may rightly take some credit for successful defensive struggle; though in most instances the happy outcome has unquestionably been due to other causes of far more complex character.

Because war is a major cause of war, and because the farther away we get from the influence of past conflict the more can be done to ensure a real peace, the share of war pre-

vention in war abolition is great. If we can meet the crises that are forced upon us and meet them so effectually that war can be kept off not for the usual single generation but for a century, we may be able to arouse so strong a popular loathing of warfare and especially so keen a pleasure in the creation of a positive, rewarding social order, that the war method will become atrophied.

Defensive tactics, therefore, will always be needed in the fight for peace. However, a considerable portion of the peace movement's comparative ineffectiveness has been due to an exaggerated emphasis on defense. And whatever the needs of the past may have been, the peace movement from now on will need as nothing else more sturdy, unyielding, drastic, inflexible and aggressive tactics. The general reliance on defensive methods, the practice of formulating programs around the moves of the war propagandists instead of taking the fight to *them,* have been due to factors other than necessity.

The offensive is to many pacifists offensive. To spare the pun is to spoil the point. Over a quarter of a century ago Miss P. H. Peckover before the peace congress at Glasgow used the term "Pacigerence." We may happily forget the word; but in its essential counterpart, the waging of peace, are clues that will lead to victory.

No Peace Except a People's Peace

President Dwight of Yale turned aside from his classroom labors on a day prior to 1794 and jotted in his notebook a shrewdly practical comment:

> . . . It is probable, that whenever mankind shall cease to make war, this most desirable event will arise from the general opposition made to war by the common voice.

Just as William Ladd was troubled by the inattention paid to the masses of everyday working people, peace leaders of the present time have recognized the same need. Says one:

> . . . never until in this country the ordinary person, the non-expert voter, is taken into the confidence of the peace expert,

never until that time can America take her place among the leaders of the peace movement in the world.[1]

Says another:

> We are a brave, wise people. We can kill Indians and wild beasts and bandits, but all of a tremble we take to the woods at the sight of a new idea. No political party has ever yet led forth with a new idea. It has only sponsored a big idea when "we, the people" behind it, have many, many votes to secure. We, the people must therefore find the idea and persuade the voters.[2]

And another one declares:

> All of these programs will be futile unless somehow we can create and establish a new code of international morality. That new ethic will never come from the diplomats, never from the foreign offices, only out of the people themselves or out of the mind and heart of some great leader.[3]

The evolution of morality, however, proceeds not so much by politics, nor by the invention of new devices or "big ideas," nor even, in complex modern civilization, by the rising of new prophets. A small school of thought may wield a tremendous leverage for social change, provided it can reach the masses of the people, stir them deeply (even, at first, to deep hostility) and by insistence on a changing program dramatize its philosophy until larger and larger groups adopt the new ethic and it becomes ultimately—by approximation at least—the code of conduct generally approved. This is what has happened in respect to the treatment of women by men within marriage and without, and it is happening with regard to the treatment of childhood; it has been the story of a hundred reforms since the first man stood up to challenge the power of blind fate over human destiny.

For two principal reasons the peace movement has been incapable of stirring the dormant masses. In the first place its appeal has been emotionally inferior. In the second place its intellectual and ethical point of view has been self-contradictory; it has set about the overthrow of a method in which it still retained a deep-lying faith.

"Hearts Are Stronger than Swords"

It was Wendell Phillips who said that, and the words were true even after he had ceased to believe them. The peace movement has lived because of its heart; but in its appeals to others it has worn its head upon its sleeve. And the popular response has been inadequate.

Only drama, full of warmth and color and clash and vivid movement, can ever awaken that slumberous giant, the people, from its multitudinous preoccupations. Drama and romance never fail.

Rudolph Valentino lying dead in a funeral parlor draws a mob of sixty thousand struggling men and women anxious to see in death the vehicle on which their emotions had ridden to exotic climes, the magic carpet which had carried them away from tenements and time clocks. The tabloid, picture-filled "newspaper" has risen phenomenally on its graphic appeal to emotion—usually the cheapest emotions—until in New York City the illustrated tabloid circulation exceeds two million. The great bulk of our people can be aroused only by vivid imagery, by conflict, by motion, by drama.

Let no one say that these people have no effect on foreign policy. Their positive effect is almost nil; their negative effect is tremendous. Over the plans and programs of peacemakers this element of our population—and that is most of us—wields a mighty veto power. They could not achieve a peaceful world; but they can prevent its coming.

Nor is all of the apathy confined, for that matter, to the groups upon whom the more privileged look down haughtily. In the State of Connecticut a study was made by one of the normal schools in 1927, "to ascertain to what extent Armistice Day programs in the cities and towns of our state included attempts to initiate or foster ideas or plans looking toward world peace." Letters of inquiry were sent to every city and town. From these, numbering in all one hundred and ninety, "the response was gratifying, forty-eight replies being received"! Following is a summary of the situation:

Towns with schools closed on Armistice Day	24
Towns with schools open on Armistice Day	18
Towns where schools have programs inculcating the spirit of peace	19
Towns where schools have no constructive program	24
Towns whose churches hold services on this day	13
Towns whose churches hold no services on this day	33
Towns whose civic organizations have programs promoting peace	9
Towns whose civic organizations have no constructive programs	35

"The survey," says the report, "showed very little activity in constructive work leading to the fostering of a will to peace." [4]

At several important conferences of religious college students, votes have revealed a fairly high percentage of pacifist students and large majorities definitely interested in promoting peace.

At the National Student Conference of the College Y.M. and Y.W.C.A.'s held in Milwaukee about New Year's Day, 1927, 740 students voted to support some wars and not others, 327 voted not to support any war, 95 voted to support any war declared by the government, and 356 were not ready to commit themselves. But such student groups as these are hardly representative and they are to some degree selected.

A recent study of one thousand students of American colleges in many different institutions, made by Dr. Eliot Porter of the University of Chicago, showed three out-and-out militarists, four complete pacifists, and six hundred and ninety-six with no decision in either direction! [5]

It is unsound tactics to labor with the government at Washington in an effort to put through legislation behind which no deep-rooted wide-awake public desire has been created.

It is unsound tactics to marshal behind the peace campaign official church bodies, for example, unless the rank and file are brought more into accord with leaders. The churches of the United States, by a refusal to aid war, might prevent any threatened conflict in which this nation is involved; but they

will hardly do so while they allow their ministers to claim exemption by the government, while the clergy ride at half fare on railroad trains, while church property remains free from taxation. And after all, were it entirely otherwise, sixty per cent of the American people belong to no church.

It is unsound tactics to hope for world peace through education unless the great majority are also touched in whose real education the schools are only a minor factor.

It is important to reach political officialdom, the churches, organized women, and educational leaders. It is also important to reach the organized and unorganized workers. To them of all people, whether they realize it or not, peace is a paramount issue. It is they who bear the brunt of war and settle its bills. It is to them, directly, that the peace movement—middle class in origin, leadership and backing—has made almost no appeal.

The peace movement to-day is not a really popular movement. It is largely a propaganda. It is financed—the acid test—by gifts of a relatively few devoted people, and it always has been. The gifts of the Ladds, Carnegies, Ginns, and others have been the chief sustaining power. In recent years there has been a widening circle of support; but still the populace, on the whole, doles out its gifts but grudgingly for peace. Most people do not give to peace work at all and have no definite connection with peace organizations. The organized peace movement is largely a high-brow, high-hat, high-finance (because poorly financed) enterprise, in which the general public has only a mild interest at all.

Why should it be otherwise? War grips the imagination with its magnificent terror. It may be feared; it can never be ignored. There is abundant evidence to show that the current idea of war's departed romance is fallacious. Oppressed by the mechanism of modern warfare we have swung to an exaggerated belief in the romance of ancient battle. A careful study will rub a great deal of tarnish off the olden glories. Men died not like flies, mercifully, quickly, but almost always by slow torture; amputations were not eased by anæsthetics; filth and

putrid germs abounded everywhere; army discipline was worse, not better; vice spread even more generally, unchecked by sanitation; eatable food was hard to obtain; continually disease ran through the troops like a decimating drumfire.

A civilization so regimented as ours, with youth so deeply chained to the machine, with the most enjoyable years filled to the brim by the bitter struggle for the means wherewith to keep the new, small families going, with even amusements standardized—to many in such a life war still holds out alluring contrast. Its hardship may be a recommendation; its danger not a drawback; its routine and its ordered discipline a relief from a routine and discipline which afford no real serenity as reward.

It may be doubted whether the popularity of stark war novels is to be attributed to any wave of genuine anti-war conviction. Rather, it may be due to the same thrilling appeal of hard experience that has given a market to such tales as those of Trader Horn, or such books as *Murder in Fact and Fiction, The Book of the Rogue,* and the hundreds of others in like vein published in the present period.

That there is an appeal in hardship for so effete a society as ours may scarcely be disbelieved. This, too, may be the real basis of the wide public response to the numerous anti-war plays, so labeled, written in the last few years. *Journey's End,* for example, when played at West Point Military Academy, "received what was said to have been the most enthusiastic and longest applause ever given by the cadets. . . ."

When Commander George M. Dyott announced semi-publicly that he wanted a fourth man to go along on his recent expedition into the Brazilian jungles, and explained that the pay was only nominal while the discomforts, hardships and dangers were real, he was swamped by no less than fifteen thousand applications within three days, many of which were rushed by air mail, telegraph, and even cable.

Many stories have been told of World War veterans returning years after to the trenches where they endured suffering. One former sergeant reported by mail to a friend, his old

Colonel back home, who had asked to be told about the condition of a dugout where the two had spent many a pain-filled, miserable night. "I tried hard to find our old dugout," wrote the sergeant complainingly, "but the country has been so mucked up since the war that I couldn't discover even a trace of it."

An Englishwoman writes:

> Peace is not easy for women who have known war. Drifting is not easy for those who have felt the glory of direction, purpose. . . . During the war God Himself seemed to lean out of Heaven to teach them how to live. Life had meaning, significance. The path was clear as a divine mission.
>
> Neither God, nor the churches, nor any philosophy has taught the world how to live decently or gloriously in peace.

Warped, perverted, mad. But translated this means: in war you *feel*.

> A steed! a steed of matchless speed,
> A sword of metal keene;
> All else to noble hearts is drosse,
> All else on earth is mean.
> The neighynge of the war horse proud,
> The rowlings of the drum,
> The clanging of the trumpet lowde,
> Be sounds from heaven that come.

This from one of the recruiting handbooks of the army. And *this* from one of the early songs of the peace movement:

> Not with the flashing steel,
> Not with the cannon's peal,
> Or stir of drum,
> But in the bonds of love;
> Our white flag floats above,
> Her emblem is the dove,
> 'Tis thus we come.

"Of all causes in history," says Percy MacKaye, "the cause of international peace is probably the noblest, yet of all symbols appealing to the world's imagination its symbol, the dove, is probably the most anemic." Mr. MacKaye is essentially right, even though male doves in the mating season will fight bloody battles to win a favored female.

The dove is no match for the devil. If war is ever to be vanquished, it will be by St. George or Raphael, not by the bird of Noah. In brief, it is only peace militant, not peace dormant, that can supplant the heroic figure of war in the hearts of the nations.[6]

Now the dove as a symbol of the peace movement is decidedly passé, though as recently as 1924 a white dove was released in a large convention hall to signify a desire for peace, only to become frightened, I noticed, by the blare of a military band and take refuge in the dark shadows under a gallery! But as everyone must realize, in its use of symbolism and color and flaming slogans and thrilling music the peace movement has sadly lagged. In fact, these very elements in peace work, when suggested, have often been frowned down as unbecoming.

"Peace expects not to triumph by the terror of her countenance, but to persuade by her beauty," said William Ladd; however he also said, "Our object is not to create excitement, but to allay it." In another place he summed up one of the most characteristic difficulties of the peace movement: "It appeals not to the boisterous and noisy passions of mankind, but to the pity and philanthropy of the humane, the common sense of the intelligent, and the piety of the Christian. Hence its 'still small voice' has been listened to by but a few; and by many it has not been heard at all."

A few years later the Reverend S. H. Gallaudet at New Haven contrasted the aims of peace societies to "the perverted spirit of the age—satisfied only by exciting and agitating movements." A writer for *The Peacemaker* in 1890, referring to his cause, stated—and clearly with reason for his deference —"Peace is an aged matron." Those were the days when peace conferences wound up their sessions with the prayerful melody, "Fly away, gentle Dove."

And now? These are the days when an inspired caption writer for the New York *Times* puts under a news photograph of a church pageant: "Heralding an Era of Friendship and Calm." Lorenzetti, the thirteenth and fourteenth-century Italian, painted a figure of Peace in the Palazzo Communale at

Siena, representing his subject as a somnolent lady with laurel around her brow, with a soft pillow under her right arm and her arm indolently supporting her head, while her left hand nonchalantly holds an olive branch. Far away from such a concept has the real peace movement come; it is still far from attaining Mr. MacKaye's colorful ideal.

The National Council for Prevention of War and some of the women's organizations, in particular, have developed plays and pageantry; but about them some element of reality is usually lacking. The plays and dialogues and pageants and songs possessing true artistic merit used by the peace movement could almost be counted on the thumbs of two hands. Those who use them and those who write them realize their limitations but are trying to do a needed work as well as they can. The real difficulty lies deeper, at the emotional roots of our activity.

Milton was dead wrong when he wrote that "peace hath her victories, no less renowned than war." It is less because the victories of peace have been few, than because they have not been dramatized, that they are not renowned at all. And they have not been dramatized because, for the most part, they have possessed too little intrinsic struggle and romance.

The Universal Peace Union, more than any peace society before or since, in this country at least, made a genuine attempt to present peace as dynamic and colorful. It was fairly successful for its day, all things considered. Through one of its most active leaders, Daniel Batchellor, a musician and teacher, it developed a large number of peace songs, especially for children. It advertised widely the symbolism in the shipment of cannon after the Civil War to Northern factories to be melted up and converted into machinery. Previously I have noted the construction of "William Penn houses," complete to the last detail, and many of these were given to schools for use by small children with appropriate instruction about the Pennsylvania experiment. One of these models was exhibited at the St. Louis Exposition in 1904, when the Union won its award for the interesting character of its educational display.

In 1871 L. Prang and Co., dealers in art goods, wrote the

American Peace Society to say, "We have not much which directly illustrates peace." The Universal Peace Union soon did have. One of its most striking undertakings was the manufacture of a peace plow and some pruning hooks from old swords, the first sword used being that of a Mexican and Civil War veteran, a colonel. The plow was sent in 1876 to the Paris Exposition and later placed in the room at Geneva where the Alabama arbitration tribunal had met.

Peace flags in great variety have been devised, most of them under the encouragement of the same organization. The International Peace Bureau promoted the use of a standard during the last few years of the century, which was sold by L. Prang and Co. and distributed by various societies; it was a flag consisting of three upright bands of color—yellow, purple, and white. Its symbolism was elaborate and even formidably complex. Later a world peace flag was used by the International Peace Congresses, the American Peace Society, and others: it showed the earth on a blue field covered with white stars; a white band crossed the globe and to the left was broken up into a spectrum representing the variations of the human race—different, but united in peace.

Developed by Henry Pettit and used by many peace groups around the world, a white-bordered peace flag came into wide approval. First introduced in 1891 it spread from one society to another. It consisted of the regular national flag surrounded by a wide white border. Sometimes the top margin would carry the words "Peace to All Nations"; occasionally a costly flag would suspend from its staff white silk streamers bearing the flags of all nations in miniature. The Daughters of the American Revolution, less intent on saving the world from revolution than latterly and strongly devoted to moderate peace programs, presented one of these flags to Andrew Carnegie and sent one to the North Pole with Admiral Peary. The Universal Peace Congress of 1904 discussed the question of adopting a peace flag; but 1904 was a post-war season and this simple matter contained "dynamite" and was tactfully dropped. Legislation proscribing the addition of anything to the national

emblem finally put the most popular peace flag out of business, and the World War buried the whole idea.

Since the War, various peace flags have been devised, utilizing every theme from bluebirds and olive branches to olive branches and doves. But none of these has aroused any appreciable following. None will, none can, until behind the peace flag is released more of the spirit of flying banners.

The world is dotted with war memorials more thickly than the heavens with stars. As one small drop in the mighty ocean of war monuments, ponder the fact that a single book—Mrs. B. A. C. Emerson's *Historic Southern Monuments*—describes one hundred and eighty-five prominent Confederate memorials. Think of the lesser monuments; think of the North; think of all wars, and imagination cannot grasp their number. Peace monuments are few: for example, the great Christ of the Andes, erected from molten cannon through the energy of Senora de Costa and the women of Argentina and Chile; the memorial to the peace treaty between Sweden and Norway; the Peace Bridge between Canada and the United States at Buffalo, and at Blaine, Washington, the Canada-U.S.A. Peace Portal to "Children of a Common Mother—Brethren Dwelling Together in Unity."

Nationalists have gone so far as to erect a monument in Serajevo to the assassin whose bullet started the World War. An inscription reads, "On This Historic Place Gavrilo Princip Proclaimed Liberty."

Ever since Charles I had a bright idea and conferred "badges of silver" on every man who had done "faithful service in the Forlorn Hope," the use of medals and decorations by the military has grown to proportions defying expert calculation. The peace movement, too, has had its badges, pins, and buttons; but again a psychological incompatibility has prevented their general adoption.

It was noted by Lecky in his *History of European Morals* that

> There is no fact of which an historian becomes more speedily or more painfully conscious than the great difference between the

importance and the dramatic interest of the subjects he treats. Wars or massacres, the horrors of martyrdom or the splendors of individual prowess, are susceptible of such brilliant colouring, that with but little literary skill they can be so portrayed that their importance is adequately realised, and they appeal powerfully to the emotions of the reader.

We shall never have the enthusiasm to erect great monuments to the victories of peace until we go forward with enthusiasm to win those victories. Years ago a number of societies planted a peace tree in Washington; but alas, it was a breadfruit tree and—so the record goes—"could not live in that climate." There in truth is symbolism!

No Compromise with War

There is a danger in ringing words; their reverberations strike hardest on the ears of those who declaim them, and often so hard as to drown out all new ideas. Truth may flash like a brilliant comet across the firmament of the mind; but it usually drags a train of qualifying circumstances.

But there can be no compromise with war. As the events of time bring great issues to a head, a period arrives when any attendant good connected with an evil institution fades into imperceptible nothingness. War, once the sport of kings, has now become a hideous threat to the ongoing society of human beings on this planet. Both War and Man cannot survive. It is true that war and war and war might sweep across the earth and leave behind the remnants of a tenacious biological species. Locally, with past civilizations, war has done just that. But the remnants of dead cities, stretching from the halls of Montezuma round the globe to the Malay archipelago and the Sumerian valleys, are clamant witnesses to the feeble hold of Man, the builder and the seer.

War prevention is important. But the goal of the peace movement must be more; that goal must be war abolition. War abolition can never be accomplished until the minds of people by millions all over the world have made the transition from a refusal to sanction war in general to oppose all wars concretely,

in particular. That opposition will have to be like granite. At every point where the appeal of war is plausible, where the war method wears away resistance, we must erect Gibraltars of conviction.

But that is not the method of the movement for world peace. It has never been the method; it is not the method now. The number of those who fight against all war has steadily been increasing, as we shall hereinafter see; but even in the very ranks of war's opponents defection has been subtle and continuous.

No war to-day could be entered into by the United States without the support of those peace advocates who have sometimes been called, invidiously, fair-weather pacifists.

There is a strong appeal in the desire to maintain respectability, to retain one's economic standing, to have the approval and not the scorn of one's fellows. There is always a temptation to tone down a movement to meet its critics. For many years the work of the American Association for International Conciliation, for example, was directed by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, but the two were kept separate to the public eye because, as the latter's Year Book puts it (1924), "There have been many persons who were willing to associate themselves with a society whose aim was International Conciliation but who objected to the phrase International Peace"—and why?—"thinking it involved them in some objectionable form of pacifism." Had these misguided ones ever studied the history of the peace movement their fears might have been dissipated. But when was it considered wise to let peace become an open object openly arrived at? "The war and its problems have created an entirely new situation. The whole world is now committed sentimentally and intellectually, except as to what Mr. Roosevelt used to call its lunatic fringe, to a policy of international peace." There is no need of pausing to examine this astounding statement; for our study of tactics it is only necessary to conclude that the proper time to start working openly for a cause is when the whole world is committed to it.

It would be nothing less than hypocrisy, however, for pacifists to assert their personal immunity to these temptations. Many a pacifist who refuses to compromise with his conscience regarding war still placates the selfsame inner guide though remaining enmeshed profitably in nauseous labor exploitation. No one human group can attain a morality very far above the level of their fellows. Any effort to differentiate between pacifists and non-pacifists on the moral criterion would be open to charges of self-gratulation, and in most cases they would be richly warranted.

The uncompromising pacifist does challenge, nevertheless, with an outspoken criticism justified by abundant evidence, the philosophical basis of the wavering peace workers' instability. He can hardly fail to observe the fact that many of those ordinarily regarded as "non-resistants" have not been pacifists in our modern sense at all.

There is clear evidence that in the later fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries Franciscan monks served frequently as military chaplains. Professor Case has reminded us (*Non-Violent Coercion,* page 203) that even Buddha when directly questioned by the general, Simha, "explicitly refused to include war and official executions in his prohibition of physical coercion." Mahatma Gandhi has declared that although he is "a confirmed war resister" and condemns war as "an unmitigated evil," none the less "if there were a national Government, whilst I should not take any direct part in any war I can conceive occasions when it would be my duty to vote for the military training of those who wish to take it." Verily, it is hard for those whose hearts are filled with a sensitive compassion to be uncoöperative with their fellows! And yet, this sort of coöperation from pacifists is all that the military needs to go on doing as it has these many centuries. Even to vote against those who hold that war is a moral and sensible method, Mahatma Gandhi finds, might seem to him coercive: "For I know that all its members [that is, of a national Government] do not believe in non-violence to the extent I do. It is not possible to make a person or a society non-violent by compulsion." *

Lao-tse, who believed that "weapons are instruments of ill omen," considered that "they are not the instruments of the princely man, *who uses them only when he needs must.*" The history of China has been used by militarists to show how a country becomes overrun by enemies and exploiters if it has no army and if it has a philosophy of pacifism. There is some truth in this; the power of the militant Nationalists has had an effect on Western capitalism. But China has never been so pacifistic either in philosophy or in respect to disarmament as many of the West have casually supposed; a hundred years ago and more, when the French and British were pushing their most effective penetration, the Chinese "army" numbered approximately eight hundred thousand men at a conservative estimate. The pacifism of China was not an aggressive, determined pacifism expressing itself in vigorous programs. The net result of this quietistic pacifism over many centuries has not been to "Chinafy" the nation, to use Roosevelt's contemptuous phrase; the real result has been expressed in the words of a missionary, a staunch champion of China's rights: "There are not half a dozen pacifists in China."

Just as Garrison could not bring himself to oppose the Civil War and later found himself supporting it, so even Mahatma Gandhi in the World War finally recruited for the British.

> I recognize [he said in a war-time letter to the Viceroy which he made public in *Young India* for October 18, 1928] that in the hour of its danger we must give, as we have decided to give, ungrudging and unequivocal support to the Empire of which we aspire in the near future to be partners in the same sense as the Dominions Overseas. But it is the simple truth that our response is due to the expectation that our goal will be reached all the more speedily.

Central in the motives underlying the compromises of peace workers and pacifists with the war method, historically and in current attitudes, is the feeling that a government, even though using a system believed immoral and stupid, is entitled to support. As stated by the *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature,* "These modern opinions (i.e.,

those opinions since the days of the early Christians) in defense of warfare, however, have evidently grown out of a desire to conciliate the civil power. . . ."

To conciliate the civil power—there is the clue to most of the peace movement's faltering, irresolute behavior; or else to conciliate those who are themselves bound to conciliate the civil power. By some curious quirk of imagination the peace movement has come to feel that the government, no matter what it is doing, must never be antagonized.

Consider the Quaker

No finer example of a pacifist group led into perilous paths by an excessively conciliatory attitude could be found than the Society of Friends. The Quakers have indeed been the salt of the earth. They have come closer and closer, with the passing years, to a weakening of their anti-war position. Indeed, it may be doubted whether in a short time, if events continue in their present course, other religious groups may not snatch their spiritual leadership away.

The name of Quaker, according to George Fox, was originally applied to them in 1650, by Gervais Bennet, a magistrate of Derby, "who was the first that called us Quakers, because I bid them tremble at the word of the Lord." [9] There was no quaking at the word of men or governments. They were always, as one of them has written, "active controversialists." [10] The picturesque and vivid quality of the Friends in their early struggles has been well told by Mary Agnes Best in *Rebel Saints.*

How General George Washington spoke kindly and appreciatively of the Quakers has often been told by modern Friends, and Washington's praise widely quoted. Less prominence has been given to the letter written to General Lacey by the Father of his Country from Valley Forge on March 20, 1778, in which he said:

> Sunday next being the time on which the quakers hold one of their general meetings, a number of that society will probably be attempting to go into Philadelphia. This is an intercourse that

we should by all means endeavor to interrupt, as the plans settled at their meetings are of the most pernicious tendency."[11]

In the early years of the organized peace movement, Quakers were found in the societies from the first, and they were faithful friends of peace. But those who were in and the leaders who were not Friends often complained of the great bulk of Quakers who remained unimpressed. Beyond the slightest doubt, many Quakers distrusted the wisdom of calling government policies into question, a practice that the peace societies, conservative as they were, could not altogether avoid. In 1829 a General Committee wrote a significant Friendly document which was accepted by the eight outstanding Yearly Meetings, and published in 1830 as *The Testimony of the Society of Friends on the Continent of America.* This *Testimony* was reprinted and distributed in 1916. It declares, of government:

> The Society of Friends, in accordance with their pacific principles, have ever believed that they were restrained from joining with others in warlike measures, to pull down, set up, or defend any government; yet they have declared that "Magistracy or civil government is God's ordinance, the good ends thereof being for the punishment of evildoers, and the praise of them that do well." So far as the requisitions of government do not violate their conscience, they are bound to obey the laws of their country, and when they cannot actively comply for conscience' sake, they passively suffer the penalties which are imposed upon them; believing it to be their religious duty to demean themselves with proper respect and submission to those who are placed over them.

It is only natural that among not a few communicants this spirit should carry over into war-time. But the "free" or "fighting" Quakers were regularly dismissed as no longer true to the Society's principles. Yet the policy of applying discipline to this sort of apostasy began to dwindle by the time of the Spanish-American War. "While many have worked earnestly to stay the curse," one Quaker said in 1901, "there have been many others who have used such excuses as these: 'God can bring good out of this seeming evil'; and 'we must be loyal to our government.'"[12]

As far back as the Napoleonic Wars the Friends organized

war relief for French prisoners in England. In practically every war where they could extend good will and creature comforts to help the suffering, Quakers have not been idle. Reconstruction work by English Quakers followed the Boer War. The magnificent work of relief done by the American Friends Service Committee during the World War and its aftermath was so well thought of that relief agencies other than Friends entrusted $10,334,084 to their administration. Between June 1, 1917, and May 31, 1926, American Friends contributed $1,677,213 not to mention gifts in kind. It was a work of far more than physical or material character; it spread a genuine good will and helped to dissipate incalculable hatreds.

And yet the Society of Friends in England sent fewer men to prison as thorough conscientious objectors than into the trenches in combatant units.[13] In the United States hardly a single Quaker refused the alternative service offered by the government, and the Friends trained a unit of one hundred relief workers under the control of the Red Cross. The overseas work of reconstructing houses and rehabilitating refugees in France was an honest effort "to reconcile inflexible principle with practical coöperation in half-way measures," as Norman Angell has said of the Quaker war policy in general. But in perspective it should cause concern to thoughtful Friends to realize how slender a contribution was made by the Society's young men to perpetuate and spread the practice of complete non-coöperation with war. There were no dismissals, so far as I can discover, of American Quakers during the World War, despite the large number who fought or the larger number who recruited, promoted war loans, or aided the war method in other ways.

How the war record of the Friends is regarded, even by strongly pro-war historians, is shown by the Syllabus in History, issued in 1926 by New York State for its public schools. The special bias of this "instruction" against thoroughgoing war dissenters lends all the more force to its praise of Quakers. Dividing war-time pacifists into three groups the Syllabus lists them thus:

a. The patriotic pacifists—those who backed the government without reservation after the war broke out, submitting loyally to the will of the majority.

b. The "conscientious objectors"—those who refused to fight but did help the cause in peaceful ways. (Note the fine work done by Quakers as ambulance drivers and hospital helpers; the teacher should call attention to the disgraceful abuse of the term "conscientious objector" by the slacker.)

c. The "militant pacifists"—those who desired to resist the government actively after war broke out in defense of their belief. (The teacher should call attention to the fact that while many of these ultraradicals considered that they were serving humanity's cause by suffering "martyrdom" for their belief, many of them were hypocrites.)

William H. Mace's *American History,* widely used as a textbook refers favorably to the Quakers and some other religious sects who "refused to fight but did not refuse to do needful things which indirectly promoted the success of the war."

Well may the Quaker query, as may all other pacifists, What Price Patriotism? Is there not abundant reason in the wartime record of the later years, for the fact that youthful Quakers in considerable numbers have taken military training in colleges, twenty-five at one time in one university alone, without the slightest protest? Is there not a danger in what one Friend has lately called "the ambiguous immunity" accorded to Quakers and other pacifist denominations under conscription plans?

Though I have dwelt upon the Friends because of their conspicuous position at the heart of the pacifist movement for three centuries, the same dilemma is faced in countless ways by other groups. When the world peace meeting at Bierville, France in 1926 voted against war unless sanctioned by the League of Nations, the problem was transferred from a reliance on national to international authority. This was a gain over the old-fashioned militaristic nationalism; but here was betrayed the same fatal tendency to bestow upon war some unquestionable, divinely endowed parentage.

Peace—Not Peaceful—Efforts

The world greatly needs Quakers. It also needs earth-

quakers, who batter away at intrenched superstitions, whose respect for hoary processes has been superseded by a faith in the future and a will to bring it nearer by valiant struggle.

War and peace cannot be reconciled. They meet head on. The strenuous efforts of many peace groups and individuals have been devoted to the task of making peace painless to their antagonists. But peace can never be made painless to those who profit by preparedness for war. Peace can never be made painless for those who have not the vision to see that security lies in "friendships, not in warships."

"All that men want to make them Peacemakers is to read and think enough on the subject candidly," said a peace worker of 1833. That is the viewpoint of present-day peace publicity. But more than publicity is required. The Temple of Peace will not rise, as an old peace leader said it would, "noiseless and without the sound of hammer"; not without lusty, resounding blows of sledge-hammer power can swords be beaten into ploughshares.

The waging of peace, taking the offensive, will bring its inevitable reaction. Conflict and clash will come; conflict and clash are exactly what are needed to arouse the masses to a perception that the war-peace issue involves their personal destinies and the future of their children. People can remain inert in the presence of propaganda and preaching; they cannot remain quiescent in the presence of a fight.

By taking a more radical position than the general public can be brought to tolerate at once, many a latent pacifist may be uncovered. That is the experience of other great reforms:

> Many individuals who do not overtly enter any of these struggles are at heart rebels and radicals, but are restrained from expressing their resentments and aspirations by various types of fear and considerations of expediency. That is one reason why radical movements, once well started, often grow with extreme rapidity.[14]

An illustration may be found in the experience of Prudence Crandall, a Quaker abolitionist. When she was attacked for educating a Negro girl in her school, she lost her white patrons and was socially ostracized. She did not desist but rather

opened up a school entirely for "young ladies and little misses of color." Her school was burned; the whole nation was stirred; her state, Connecticut, passed its "Black Law" against the education of non-resident colored students. Nevertheless, so powerful were the supporters raised up by her bold, high-principled action, that five years later (1838) the law was repealed and a great gain had been made for abolition.

One man has described himself in *Who's Who in America* by the terse designation, "Pacifist." For a considerable period after the War, pacifists were earnestly admonished to "play down" or dodge entirely the words "pacifist" or "pacifism," and not a few took the advice. Publishers dissuaded authors from its use; editors of pacifist magazines—though not all of them!—steered away from the dangerous terms.

We have moved on somewhat from these compromises. Pacifists have increased in numbers and in boldness. Among the younger pacifists, especially, there is a determination to claim for these words the rich and honorable meaning the history of pacifism has given them, and to add new color and depth and honor as the years bring new opportunities for faithful action. These would accept proudly, and underscore as he never did, the wisdom of Noah Worcester: "If men must have objects for the display of heroism, let their intrepidity be shown in firmly meeting the prejudices of a world in favor of war." And they would add, in deference to what to-day is sometimes a greater obstacle," the prejudices of a world in favor of peace."

They will not, in large numbers, share the social philosophy of Bartolomeo Vanzetti; but they will share his belief that "we have war because we are not sufficiently heroic for a life which does not need war." They will do their utmost to contribute manfully to the development of a new order of human association, so full of joy and zest, for all who labor with hand or brain, that war's ugliness will be seen for what it really is. In the achievement of that new life the way of pacifism will be indispensable.

CHAPTER XXIII

THE PACIFIST INHERITANCE

They say to me: If we refuse to fight, we'll all go to hell together.

I say to them: If we agree to fight, we'll all go to hell together.

We've tried fighting. Are you satisfied with what fighting has done?

Let's try not fighting. Let's see what that will do.

HORACE TRAUBEL, in *The Conservator.*

CHAPTER XXIII

THE PACIFIST INHERITANCE

THE world's first pacifists are of course unknown. Far back in time, buried beneath the dust of accumulated centuries, there must have been those who fought against the rise of warfare.

For warfare was one time a new development. There is evidence strongly indicative of a rather general, if not universal, absence of war among the early peoples. Both from the uncovered traces of primitive tribes which perished long ago, and among savage tribes still in existence and as yet untouched by civilization, modern scholars have been forced to challenge the old notion that man everywhere sprang from the loins of Mother Earth a destructive, feral creature, dividing his time between the hunting of animals and the extermination of his kind.

With the development of agriculture and the storing of foodstuffs, in other words with the accumulation of wealth, war of the hungry on the well-fed, it is believed, began; and from that time until the present, war has marched triumphantly down the ages, gathering new power and deadliness and dragging humanity along a tortuous road of suffering.

It is one of the strange paradoxes of history that the world's first pacifist should have lain in an unknown tomb in Egypt until 1907. Akhnaton, father of Tutankamen, ruled as Pharaoh from 1375 to 1358 B.C. As a young man he rebelled against the priestcraft of Amon-Ra, and established a City of the Horizon with many features suggestive of utopian ambitions. Like Jesus, he died a young man still, and likewise in the face of defeat; for his realm was overrun by hosts of armed invaders and his idol-free, monotheistic worship of Aton, the

Sun God, was relegated to the limbo of forgotten ideals by the freshly intrenched hierarchy.

It is perhaps unwise, pending further information, to hail Akhnaton as "the world's first idealist"; other factors not readily discernible may have been in part responsible for his acts. But it seems clear that he was a sturdy pacifist; he is depicted as no warrior; he refused to invoke the ordeal by battle to settle the fate of his dominions, choosing that course which was more consistent with his nature and his religion. "There died with him," declares Professor James A. Breasted, "such a spirit as the world had never seen before." Says Professor Arthur E. P. Weigall:

> When the world reverberated with the noise of war, he preached the first known doctrine of peace; when the glory of martial pomp swelled the hearts of his subjects he deliberately turned his back upon heroics. He was the first man to preach simplicity, honesty, frankness and sincerity, and he preached it from a throne. He was the first Pharaoh to be a humanitarian; the first man in whose heart there was no trace of barbarism.[1]

The emigrating Jews of ancient Palestine found opposed to their conquest of Canaan numerous war-like peoples, and proceeded to outdo them, if anything, in fury and cruelty. It was only natural that a persecuted people whose history was destined to be full of spectacular ups and downs should produce few prophets of peace. However, the advice of Isaiah to Hezekiah not to bend the knee to Sennacherib, the terrorizing Assyrian conqueror, but to depend on Jehovah to protect Jerusalem, suggests definite leanings toward the type of passive resistance looking for deliverance solely to supernatural intervention. And Zechariah looked ahead to the day when Jehovah "will cast off the chariot from Ephraim and the horse from Israel, and the battle bow shall be cut off; and he shall speak peace unto the nations; and his dominion shall be from sea to sea, even to the ends of the earth."

About two centuries after Isaiah's counsel of non-violent resistance, the youthful prophet Jeremiah got himself in hot water by advising his people not to put faith in the power of

their troops or their Temple to protect them from the great sweep of Nebuchadnezzar and his Babylonian armies. Only a non-violent submission to the inevitable chastening that was the will of Jehovah could avert an overwhelming disaster. But Jeremiah, suspected of pro-Chaldean sympathies, only let himself in for a long series of trials and tribulations. The prophet was not heeded; and the city fell amid rapine, fire and slaughter. The victorious king gave Jeremiah his choice of living in Babylon or in the country near Jerusalem, and he decided to remain and wear down, probably, the popular feeling, by ministering to the miserable wretches too worthless to be carried into exile a thousand miles away. As usual with prophets, long after his death he was regarded no longer as a traitor, and was hailed (see Second Maccabees xv. 14) as "the lover of the brethren, he who prayeth much for the people and the holy city, Jeremiah the prophet of God."

In India, five hundred years before Christ, Gautama, the Buddha, the Awakened One, preached his principle of purity, renunciation, harmlessness, non-violence. In the quest for a pure and noble life he admonished, "As a noble steed stung by the lash, be ye spirited and swift." "By hating," he taught, "hatred doth not cease at any time; by love doth hatred cease; this is the ancient law. Overcome anger by love; overcome evil with good; meanness with a gift, and a liar with the truth."

At about the same time, in ancient China, Confucius was teaching conduct in which violence was deprecated. Lao-tse, the great exponent of Taoism, was advocating "non-action" and deflating the art of war in favor of the man of repose and calm, and unruffled, serene nobility. Mencius, another great Chinese sage, strongly indicted war. "Those who are skillful to fight," said he, "should suffer the highest punishment." But far too pacifistic, even for Mencius, was Mo-Ti, with whom he quarreled. Mo-Ti believed that "the will of heaven is love of all," and deemed all men truly brothers, so that the ruling principle of action should be "equal love of all." He denounced fighting in scathing terms. Once at least he intervened to prevent a war. Hearing that a near-by king was planning to start

a devastating conflict with a new device for battering down the walls of cities, he walked for ten days and nights, bearded the king in his capital, and daringly made successful protest. "Before I met you," said the king of Chu, "I wanted to conquer the state of Sung. But since I have seen you, I would not have it even if it were given me without resistance." Mo-Ti replied, "If so, then it is as if I did already give you the state of Sung. Persist in your righteous course, O King, and I will give you the whole world." [2]

After centuries of war and suppression in Palestine came an unmistakably authentic pacifist voice in the young Jew of Nazareth, bringing bitter disappointment to those of the Zealots and nationalists who, misunderstanding his point of view, had all but groomed him for the rôle of deliverer by violence. The incalculable influence let loose in the world by his brief career served to sustain his early followers for nearly a hundred and fifty years in fairly consistent ranks against all military compromise with the Roman power. The evidence is abundant showing how definitely the practice of the first Christians was opposed to war. Justin Martyr, in the second century, A.D., asserted that "we who once were slayers of one another do not now fight against our enemies." Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons at about the same period, stated that the followers of Jesus had given up the use of weapons and no longer knew how to fight. "I am a Christian, and therefore I cannot fight"—words like these were paralleled many times, as the records prove. Tertullian, the vigorous Christian leader, was saying at the end of this century, "Shall it be deemed lawful to make a profession of the sword, when the Lord proclaims that he who takes the sword shall perish by the sword?" "For what wars should we not be fit," he challenges, "we who so willingly yield ourselves to the sword, if in our religion it were not counted better to be slain than to slay?" Even as late as the close of the third century, Lactantius declared that "to engage in war cannot be lawful for the righteous man, whose warfare is that of righteousness itself."

It must not be supposed that the treatment accorded these

Christian pacifists was always one of unmitigated severity. In fact they so impressed their judges on some occasions that the latter sought to find all sorts of evasions whereby to avoid the heavy penalties of the law. Nevertheless, the dissenters from the military and religious regimen of Rome were often put to death by fiendishly cruel torture.

However, long before the conversion of Constantine their original fidelity was on the wane. It actually reached the point where Christian leaders became aggrieved because the Romans sometimes dismissed Christians from the army on account of their religious theology! But only with the acceptance of Christianity as a state religion in 312 A.D. and the gradual emergence of the religion named for Jesus as an organization possessing wealth and power and a fierce ambition to conquer territories and converts in one operation—only then was the bright ideal of Jesus completely submerged beneath the eclipse of the Dark Ages.

And yet the seeds of truth do not easily die. Lying on stony ground for several centuries, they were to sprout and take root when the winds of time had blown a little soil upon them. The blood of the martyrs was to be, if not the seed of the church, the seed of some highly interesting heresies.

Old-World Christian Pacifism

Arising in the seventh century among the foothills of Transcaucasia, a sect known as the Paulicians contended by propaganda and by force of arms to spread their dualistic doctrine that all matter is evil and that Christ suffered not in reality but only in an ethereal form. They were persecuted and driven westward, where through the succeeding centuries their military ardor succumbed to their asceticism, and finally waned until they became complete believers in non-violence.

Known as the Cathari, or Albigenses, they multipled in influence and came into hostile conflict with the Papacy. In their most fervent groups they abjured not only all use of violence, but all sexual functions, the slaughter of animals, all oaths and the demands of civil government. Against them the Church

waged a cruel, relentless and undiscriminating campaign of extermination.

This frenzy of extirpation was likewise directed against the Waldenses, who also rejected violence, oath-taking, and all compromise with the ruling power, but who were almost if not wholly free from the ascetic practices of the Albigensians. Under the leadership of Peter Waldo, a merchant who brought great riches and devotion to the movement and gave both without stint, the "Poor Men of Lyons" or "Picards," or "Josephites," or "Arnoldites," or "Berengarians," as they were variously called, moved about in a constant effort to escape the persecution to which they were everywhere subjected, exerting a marked influence within limited spheres, and holding so tenaciously to their belief that remnants of their faith are still in existence. But as time went on their pacifist zeal died down, and by the middle of the sixteenth century the Vaudois, as they were called in France, "had now no other alternative but to arm in their own defence; and though out of a population of about 15,000 only 2,500 were capable of bearing arms, yet this handful more than once repulsed the united forces of the king of France and the duke of Savoy." [8] When visited by one student over a hundred years ago, already a vast change had brought their rebellions to the point where they were described not only as conspicuously honest and cleanly in their habits—facts long conceded by all—but in social viewpoint distinguished from their neighbors by "a more respectful demeanor to their superiors" and "more loyalty to their sovereign."

When St. Francis of Assisi organized his movement, it not only constituted a mighty protest against the compromises into which the Church had fallen, but it pointed toward a way of life not dissimilar in numerous aspects from the pacifism of other groups. Francis himself was a true believer in non-violence, and the Third Franciscan Order, required to follow literally the teachings of Jesus, was directed explicitly against combat: "Let them not take up the arms of death against anybody or bear such themselves." Among the Fraticelli, the

nondescript groups which in varying degree embodied the Franciscan spirit, there was often a great deal of pacifism, which at times led them to throw in their lot with the Cathari.

One of the most striking heresies of all was the movement of the Lollards, inspired by the English leader, John Wycliffe. Here was one who would not allow to go unchallenged the manner in which the Church kept on piling up property while emphasizing its creeds and ceremonials, and yet one who recognized the power of a pacific revolt. Wycliffe was the translator of the English Bible, a brilliant expositor, a man of resource and pleasing character, yet one whose sympathies were frankly with the lowly. He protested boldly the way in which the priesthood threw their backing to warriors and even took arms themselves; "Christ," he insisted, "taught not his apostles to fight with the sword of iron, but with the sword of God's word, which standeth in meekness of heart and in the prudence of man's tongue." His followers were persecuted and many martyred, like Sir John Oldcastle, "the good Lord Cobham" of the proletariat, who was accused in large measure because he denounced war as the plundering of the poor for the benefit of monarchs.

The Lollards spread their ideas to the Continent through traveling students and artisans, and in Bohemia the situation was ripe and ready for such a message. Wycliffe's central doctrine was that of "Lordship," or perhaps, in more modern terms, "Trusteeship" over property. Thus he embraced the ideal of poverty and yet avoided mendicancy; thus he let loose ideas which, in corruption-ruled Bohemia, contained political dynamite.

John Huss was the vehicle though there were strong national elements in his movement, for this revolutionary concept. Huss developed the idea, applied it concretely with inexorable logic, and unleashed the lightning of political revolt. The reaction carried him through stress and tribulations to a martyr's death at the stake. Through all that came, however, he bore himself with saintly fidelity to principle; unremittingly he pressed for his reforms, but he would not betray his trust in the way of

love and non-violent resistance. It was not so with all of his followers. The fire that seared his unsurrendering body was like a torch to an inflammable countryside. To arms sprang Hussites by thousands, and there followed a bloody war in which the Roman power emerged triumphant.

Triumphant over the Hussite armies. But not victorious over the Hussites who clung to the way of Huss himself. These were the members of the Unitas Fratrum, or Bohemian Brethren. Despite the continual oppression of the Church, they grew in numbers and in the steadfastness of their purpose. Interestingly similar to the statement of American Quakers in 1830 is their declaration that "civil power is intended for the punishment of those who have broken the laws of society and must be coerced within proper bounds. It arose in the heathen world. It is absolutely wrong to use it in matters of religion."

When at length the Protestant Reformation raised the siege to which all "heresies" had been subjected, the Moravian Church sprang full-fledged from the old Unitas Fratrum organization which had been unbrokenly self-perpetuated. The Moravians do not explicitly set forth a creed and so their non-violent principles are discoverable rather in their customs than in any formal pronouncements. But their pacifism is well known. Though in the early days of their penetration in the New World they fared less well than Penn's colony with the Indians—chiefly because of a war policy carried on by whites almost on their doorstep—they accepted arms but little and used them practically not at all, soon giving them up entirely.

The history of the Anabaptists, the stormy petrels of the Reformation, has a close bearing on the development of pacifism, but it is far too complex for much discussion here. Not only were most of their leaders definitely hostile to the Church's authoritarianism, but they had scant regard for the civil power, holding it on the whole opposed to liberty of conscience and inimical to the spiritual growth of men. Following the failure of the Peasant's Revolt by arms the non-violent method of the Anabaptists found a ready ear. At once it offered a means of practical expression for rebellion and a mode of attaining

spiritual satisfaction from mystical kinship with Jesus. At Münster the temptation to resort to arms led to a seizure of the city, but after a long siege it was retaken; and again the futility of force used by a minority was evident. The instrument by which the principle of non-violent resistance was to be carried onward and coupled to a policy of submissiveness to the state was Menno Simons. Simons, having renounced Catholicism in 1536 at the age of forty-four, marshaled the pacific Anabaptists into a well-organized body. Despite his non-violence, he was an outspoken disputant of war-making governments, and he was forced to live a nomadic life with a price upon his head, hated alike by Catholic and Protestant for his pacifist agitation, his doctrine of separation of church and state, and his advocacy of non-participation in civic affairs.

At last after many years the Mennonites were so generally admired that Frederick the Great induced some of them to leave their retreat in Switzerland and settle in Prussia, granting them exemption from military service. After three-quarters of a century Russia begged them to settle on some waste land, offering them every inducement, including free transportation. The Germans, anxious to keep them, refused them passports; but they escaped secretly across the border. In Russia they aroused envy by their prosperous proof that the meek shall inherit the earth; and despite the pleading of the Tsar many moved to America. Thus, as Professor C. M. Case points out, "In all this is presented the remarkable spectacle of a people, declared to be dangerous to all civil order, everywhere lauded as citizens, and everywhere begged, by the 'imperial' government itself, to remain under its rule." In 1663 and 1683 Mennonite settlements were undertaken in the American Colonies, and to-day the descendants of these early immigrants constitute a body faithful to the anti-war tenets of their tradition. They have also settled in Canada and have tried to establish a settlement in Paraguay.

One movement of pacifism within the churches is that of the Collegiants, which arose among the Dutch in 1619. The Collegiants agitated for a creedless form of worship. Spinoza,

when expelled from the synagogue, spent five years among friends who were members of this group, and regarded them highly. The nobility of their lives seems to have deeply impressed all who knew them, despite their definite stand against oath-taking and all war.

In Holland, only one year after the birth of the organized peace movement, a pacifist community called the Christian Brotherhood was formed, and was obliged to suffer imprisonment and general persecutions.

In a measure the spiritual descendants of the Bohemian Brethren and the Moravians, the Schwenkfelders were another pacifist sect of Germany. Their founder, Caspar Schwenkfeld, was a nobleman, whose pursuit of peace in the pacifist sense emanated from a search for a peace of soul: "the attainment of a joy which spreads through the inward spirit and shines on the face—a joy which can turn hard exile into a *Ruheschloss,* 'a castle of peace.' " [4] Driven from Prussia to Saxony and from thence to America, they are still active in the United States, where their principles of peace, though not conspicuously promoted, are adhered to with a great deal of fidelity.

Based not on a mystical aspiration but a literalistic faithfulness in all acts of life to the teaching of the Bible, a sect of Baptist Brethren was formed in Schwarzenau in the early years of the eighteenth century. Known as the Dunkers, or Tunkers, or Dunkards, they went through the same bitter travail as the earlier non-violent sects, despite their inattention to public and social questions. Traveling over sixty thousand miles, it has been estimated, in search of religious liberty, they finally reached Pennsylvania in 1720 and in this country they have spread and have lived their quiet, agrarian lives comparatively unmolested except in time of war.

The Quakers like the Mennonites based their religion not on authority from without but on the "inner light." But more than any other pacifist groups, the Society of Friends brought to practical human problems a fighting spirit. And the direction of the Quaker's effort was somewhat different. "It is upon social history that his influence has chiefly told. The

unique feature of his career has been that he largely succeeded in living out his unwritten creed in a philosophy that made belief a conduct of life, and manifested to the world its practicality as a working theory." [5]

From the time of its founding by George Fox in the middle of the seventeenth century, the Society of Friends became admired or hated for its combination of brave, unflinching nonviolent attack and its devotion to humanitarian causes. Not merely in generous charity, for which they have ever been noted, did the Quakers excel. They contributed to the great cause of religious liberty through victories bought with blood —blood of their own, not that of others. They fought through to a new respect for woman as a thinking person. They lived and struggled for democracy. They furnished countless examples of practical political idealism by their Cobdens and Brights in England and their Penns in America—it is not generally known that they furnished a line of governors to Rhode Island, one to Maryland, and legislators in large number. They led in the struggle for Negro freedom, and if some closed their meetinghouses to abolitionists, others joined wholeheartedly with that movement. They advanced international peace by their own ambassadors of good will, their work for arbitration and other moderate measures, and especially by their traditional unwillingness to sanction war. And with it all, despite the inevitable exceptions, they drew men to them; they made it impossible on more than one occasion for a fighting squad to pull the triggers of rifles aimed at their unquaking breasts; they were flaming and serene, conciliatory and indomitable. They could sing:

Your Gaoles we fear not,
    No nor banishment.
Terrors nor threats can ere make
    us lament
For such we are as fear the liveing God
Not being vexed by persecution's Rod.
Away hippocrisie, adew false fear,
Immortal life's the crown which we doe bear,
Which cannot be removed from us away,

That makes us scorn your
threatenings every day.
These are our prayers & thus
our Souls doe cry—
Let justice live and all
oppression die.[6]

Beginning in the eighteenth century, a society of "spirit fighters," or Doukhobors has existed in Russia. They were opposed to any part in government. They were communists; but their communism has no connection with the communism of Soviet Russia, being derived instead from the communistic principles of the Apostles. Although their adherence to anti-war principles had been varied in its consistency through their long history, a reading of Tolstoy convinced the Doukhobors' leader, Peter Verigin, while exiled in Siberia, that resistance to military service, as frequently it had been in the past, should now be a sacred inviolable duty. Sharp clashes with the government followed. A migration to Canada was planned and carried into effect in 1899 by the moral and financial aid of Tolstoy and his friends, and also with the coöperation of English and American Quakers.[7]

Another communistic non-violent sect was the Shakers, who originated in England in 1770 and after ten years of ceaseless intolerance were able to find on the soil of this Western continent a refuge. They were once a real factor in the anti-war struggle and they coöperated actively with the Universal Peace Union; but to-day there are only a handful of survivors.

The Community of True Inspiration at Amana, Iowa, is still another communistic anti-war society with roots in the early German non-violent rebellions, as also are the Ephrata Communists of Pennsylvania and the Separatists or Zoarites, of Ohio.

It will readily be seen that behind the development of the organized peace movement there had been a long and irrepressible conflict between the way of war and the way of good will. That struggle now entered a new stage. No longer was the conflict associated so much with wars of religion; instead it was

now centered in the civil power bent on employing conscription —conscription of brawn, and, so far as it could, conscription of conscience.

Lone Voices

We have followed the vicissitudes of the organized fight for peace. But within the peace societies, and outside them, and even before they were ever dreamed of, there were those to cry out in protest against warfare in the New World of America.

Even among the American Indians, long held up—and often quite unjustly—as uniformly fierce and combatant, there were prophets who urged their people to rely on heavenly intervention for defense and who denounced war in ringing speech. "Prophets have been more numerous in aboriginal America than among any other race or people or culture save the Jews," declares a recent student.

> Generally [he says] they taught universal peace, not only forbidding war of Indian against Indian, but war of Indian against white; they recommended the giving "unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's," until such time as the imminent millennium arrives—for they taught that the Indians were the Chosen People of the Great Spirit and that through a cataclysm the whites and all non-believing Indians would sink away, the earth would be renewed, and the Indians would live in an earthly paradise. . . . Meantime the Indians were not to fight but merely to watch and pray. . . . The ways of the ancestors were best. The Indians must even give up firearms.[8]

Among the Ohio Delawares a prophet whose name is unknown delivered a message from the Great Spirit, condemning intertribal war, polygamy, alcohol, and sorcery. There is one record of an old Indian warrior, a great counselor called Buckinjehillish, who protested against a war planned by the Indians of western New York, and who declared that "none but the ignorant made war, but that the wise men and warriors had to do the fighting." Buckinjehillish, after a council of the tribal leaders, was adjudged a witch and was sentenced to death.[9]

Among the colonists, excepting for the Quakers and other non-violent sects, pacifism was almost, but not wholly, unknown. The records of the General Court show that in one of the early wars of Virginia a Richard Binkley refused to take up arms and "was sentenced to lie neck and heels for twelve hours." [10]

There were some pacifists in the Revolutionary War who were not members of non-violent denominations, but only a few. Outstanding among these was the Reverend John Sayre, of the Church of England, a graduate of King's College (now Columbia University). He had looked after five parishes in New York State as minister and medical physician for the sum of thirty pounds a year. He preached once to delegates from New York and New Jersey gathered in a convention in Trinity Church. In 1774 he went to Fairfield, Connecticut, and found himself surrounded by the roiling conflicts between Tory and Revolutionist. In his services he omitted that part of the English Liturgy containing prayers for the king, as he put it, "for peace' sake." He refused his sanction to violence on either side, but those were times when everyone who was not openly a Revolutionist was deemed a Loyalist and traitor.[11] His residence was attacked by two hundred militia and he was banned for eighteen months to the region around New Britain where Elihu Burritt later was to plow and talk with his beloved birds. The populace had become infuriated when Sayre refused to subscribe to a revolutionary manifesto, on the ground that the weapons of Christ were spiritual, and that he, as a Christian minister, could not "promise to take up and use any carnal weapons at all." He also rebelled against that part of the manifesto barring the extension of kind offices or hospitality, which he held to be a duty of all true Christians, even to an enemy. Before the town was burned, in 1779, Sayre passionately interceded with the British general, but in vain. Upon this failure all hands turned against him on shore, and facing the probability of seeing his family mobbed and perhaps killed, he finally, with his wife and eight young children, was forced to take refuge on the British fleet.

Even the members of recognized anti-war sects did not escape the fury of the war-determined revolutionaries. There were a few real Tories among them, and there were a considerable number who entered the Continental Army; the majority sympathized with the justice of the American cause but would not take part in war. Some of these were drafted into the militia and were persecuted, abused or jailed. Some of the Friends' schools were shut down. Twoscore of Philadelphia Quakers were driven on foot far into Virginia when they refused to give paroles upon their false arrest as Tory suspects, where they were forced to remain in conditions worse than those at Valley Forge, two of the group dying from exposure.

Not everywhere, however, was intolerance the rule. A Friend in Providence, Rhode Island, wrote in his journal:

> On first-day the 18th of 6th month [1775] a paper was sent from our deputy-governor to the Friends of our meeting, requesting that such as had small arms would produce them at the court-house next day, in order that the guns in the government might be known, and an account thereof sent to the continental congress. After mature consideration, a paper was signed by such male members of our society as lived within the town, in answer to said request, informing that our religious principles and conscientious persuasion did not admit of a compliance. This was carried to the deputy-governor, who received it kindly, and seemed satisfied, saying he believed liberty of conscience was the natural right of all mankind.[12]

In the early decades of the peace societies most of their conspicuous leaders escaped the direct issue of military training, due largely to the fact that they were over age. The laws governing attendance at militia musters were strict in some of the states, but the absence of war for the period between 1815 and 1846 led to a somewhat easy-going attitude in a country not as yet disposed to relish the principle of conscription.

David Low Dodge, however, had no illusions. In one place he wrote:

> Only let it be styled "patriotic" to persecute the followers of the Lamb of God, and we should soon see the heroes of this world drunk with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus; and probably many

would be as conscientious as Paul was while breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the meek and lowly Jesus.

Dodge's pamphlet, *The Mediator's Kingdom,* brought down the wrath of the authorities on Timothy Watrous and his wife at Waterford, near New London, Connecticut. The couple were aroused by it to fresh resistance against the payment of military taxes. Repudiating military service, rejecting the alternative of a money payment, they were tied to a whipping post and lashed in the public square. The Watrouses belonged to the Rogerenes; this pacifist group is strangely neglected by the writers on pacifist religious societies.[18]

The Rogerenes, sometimes called erroneously Rogerene Quakers, were perhaps the most vigorous and aggressive nonviolent agitators the world has ever seen. Even allowing for the detractions of their critics, most of whom were biased, one must acknowledge the presence in their tactics of certain actions which were in effect irritants for the sake of irritation only. But in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries they waged a telling campaign against the union of church and state in old Connecticut, against the blue laws and against the smug intrenchment of the clergy in corrupt, intolerant and vicious rings of political chicanery. They went through imprisonment again and again; they underwent scourgings, expropriation of land, seizure of their live stock and every device calculated to break the spirit of the most valiant; but in spite of all, they "kept coming back for more."

The Rogerenes entertained Quakers; they held no reverence for religious pomp and ceremonial; they chose to worship on the seventh day of the week; they objected to a paid clergy. But when a Congregational church was renovated and enlarged, the Rogerenes were assigned seats and assessed for their share of the cost; their seventh-day worship and their first-day labor were execrated. However, they availed themselves of every chance to force the issue to a head. They laughed at the custom of clerical "bigwiggery" by sending a wig in response to a circular request for donations. When forbade Saturday wor-

ship they promptly appeared in the road directly opposite the church of their oppressors, where all through the Sunday services would be heard the reproachful and maddening clank of picks and the rattle of barrows—road improvement with a none too subtle *double entendre!*

The Battle Axe, a scathing denunciation of war, was written and circulated as widely as could be by Timothy Watrous (born in 1740), father of the one who was publicly whipped. In all probability, Timothy Watrous, Jr., added some portions and rewrote others. Its general withering irony is sampled in the following extracts:

Satan, to all classes of the Ecclesiastical system that profess Christ's name and prove traitors to his service.

I now address you as my sworn subjects, under full power of my authority; feeling much gratified to see my kingdom established on the ruins of God's creation. . . . I am your God, and I warn you of my great enemy Christ; that you be not found obedient to any of the requirements of his contracted plan. My ways are broad and easy. I am high in heart and teach the same to you. . . . Let my servants, your ministers, be men of the best gifts and talents, for so were your fathers, the false prophets. . . . Faithful subjects, when you execute the priest's office in my service, put on a dress suitable to your ministration; and let your bodily presence be amiable and your speech affable, and your countenance grave and solemn. . . .

Agreeably to my counsel, in all cases resent an insult from your fellows and go forth to war with them; embody yourselves and march to the field of battle, with religion at your right; and appoint one of my servants, your ministers, a chaplain to pray for your souls. And there encamp, one against the other; and let my servants, your priests, on both sides, put up a prayer to the God of heaven that you may gain the victory over each other; cherishing the belief that all that die gloriously in battle go immediately to heaven. And when you are coming together to do the work of human butchery, if a sense of the horrid piece of work which you are about to perform shall fill your soldiery with terror, benumb their senses with intoxicating liquor; and put on confusion and distraction, under the name of courage and valor; and fear not, for I will be with you and fill your hearts with such vengeance, through the immediate influence of my spirit, that you shall be able to perform all my will and pleasure. And when you

have sufficiently soaked the ground with the blood of your fellow men, and humbled their hearts and have gotten your will upon them; then return and let my servant, your minister, lift up his voice before you, unto the God of heaven, with praise and thanks for the victory; that you have been able to do such deeds as to bereave parents of their sons, wives of their husbands, and children of their fathers. . . . And then return home full of the glory of your own shame, and tell your rulers you have saved their pride, gratified their ambition, and saved a little of the trash of this world; for which you have taken the lives of your fellow creatures, each one of whom is worth more than all the treasures of India. For all such things belong to the religion that I delight in.

Small wonder that such pacifists as these were perpetually in conflict. Their influence though largely local was considerable; their message carried across two centuries, affecting the thought of several pacific statesmen who grew up in contact with them, and vitalizing the peace movement after the Civil War notwithstanding the defection of some of their young men during that exacting conflict.

Though the treatment meted out to Timothy Watrous was hardly typical, local authorities began to be perplexed by the individuals not belonging to pacifist sects and yet abjuring war, and also by a rising protest against military service noticeable within the recognized anti-militaristic churches. The peace journals of the next thirty years take note of pleas to legislatures for exemption. Sometimes, as in the case of Maryland, these were heeded, though with provisions for alternative labor or cash services; sometimes the state governments were reluctant to establish such a legal precedent but refrained from making the matter a public issue; sometimes it was no problem due to the absence of all conscientious objection.

In South Carolina, surrounded by a smoldering inferno of war sentiment, Judge Thomas S. Grimké sent a long communication to the State legislature arguing not only for a policy of hateless though firm resistance to federal coercion, but ending:

I, at least, have resolved, and may God give me strength to abide by that holy purpose, that come what may, I shall never bear arms in a civil combat. Property, personal liberty, life itself, are my country's. They are in her power. I have loved: I have honored: I have served her. Let her make me a pauper; let her cast me into the dungeon of her wrath; let her drag me on the traitor's hurdle to the scaffold of her avenging justice; but never can she blot out of my soul a brother's love; never shall she brand that soul with a brother's blood.[14]

In the 'thirties a young man by the name of David Campbell was confined in a Massachusetts jail for two short terms of six days each; this case was a spur to the Garrison forces of 1838. Against a half-hearted persecution of all pacifists it was necessary to carry on a watchful struggle. But the real test was to come with the titanic upheaval that rent the country in a needless, hideous slaughter.

The Civil War, with wholesale suppression of civil liberties on both sides, severely tried the Quakers, Mennonites, and other non-warring societies.[15] As we have seen, a good many fell in behind the bands and fought for the North.

In the South, where they were notorious foes of slavery, they were looked upon as vipers. Nevertheless all Friends, Dunkers and Mennonites were exempted by the Confederate government provided they paid five hundred dollars or hired substitutes or accepted hospital positions. Some of the Friends felt that to acquiesce in such a scheme would be evasion, and they rejected all service whatsoever. With these it went hard. They were tortured. One of them died in the guardhouse after a long diet of nothing but cottonseed meal. Isaiah Macon was compelled to take part in the battle of Winchester.

But he stopped no bullets. He had nothing to do but to trust in God and await the end of the terrible scene. He seemed to possess a charmed life. His comrades fell all around him, their places being filled by others who wondered at the strange sight—a man with plain citizen's clothes, having neither pistol, sword, nor gun, and no military cap, calmly filling his place in battle line, but taking no part in the battle. . . . As his company turned to flee he calmly laid down on the ground. Northern soldiers soon discovered him, peaceful amidst all; no shot had he fired, no part

had he taken. . . . He was soon in Point Lookout prison, where in a few days he died, doubtless from mental suffering.[16]

About the last phrase there is an *ex parte* tone. Possibly, also, about the same writer's story of Solomon Frazier, although it is quite in character:

Solomon Frazier was so meek and endured all their persecutions with such patience that the Captain got very angry, and told him he must now take a gun or die. While the officer was tying a gun to his arm, Solomon remarked to him: "If it is thy duty to inflict this punishment upon me, do it cheerfully; don't get angry about it." The Captain then left him, saying to his men, "If any of you can make him fight, do it, I cannot."

In the North, Quakers were exempted from the earliest draft. The exemption was objected to in Congress, but when a convention of Friends was held, at the instance of the government, and reaffirmed their historic position, Stanton—whose mother was leader of a Quaker meeting—succeeded in putting through an exemption providing for alternative relief service or the payment of three hundred dollars.

Those who held to a thorough non-participation in the war suffered hardships. Cyrus Pringle, a young pacifist of Vermont, was staked out by taut cords and left to lie on rain-soaked ground, but this and various other modes of torture failed to move the spirit of the conscientious Quaker, who provoked a colonel to exclaim that "a man who would not fight for his country deserved to die." Pringle kept a detailed diary of his experiences and it is a stirring record.[17] At length, he and the two pacifist conscripts with him were sent home by the direct intervention of Lincoln.

Incidentally, in spite of the hard measures which Lincoln had sanctioned, the suspension of the *habeas corpus* and the arrests of recalcitrants by the thousands, his handling of the Quakers can evoke to-day only that warmth of affection that he could so generally kindle among his contemporaries. When he was shot, a letter was found in his pocket from the widow of Joseph John Gurney, who had besought his aid once before

for the conscientious objectors. Lincoln had just written her, in part:

> Your people, the Friends, have had and are having a very great trial. On principle and faith, opposed to both war and oppression they can only practically oppose oppression by war. In this dilemma some have chosen one horn of the dilemma and some the other. For those appealing to me on conscientious grounds I have done, and shall do, what I could and can do in my own conscience under my oath to the law.[18]

Eliza Gurney did not agree that there was more than one way for a loyal Friend; and as the assassin's bullet found its mark, it sped past these words—kept at hand by the newly reëlected President, apparently to ponder:

> The only victory which they as followers of the Prince of Peace can with consistency rejoice in is that which is obtained through the transforming power of the grace of God.

The Voices Multiply

The World War was a conflict of unimaginable dimensions. Only in the remote fastnesses of primitive jungles were people who failed to feel its burning hand upon their shoulders. Inevitably, of course, it swept up all humanity into its witch's caldron. Millions of people found the war in accord with their tradition, training and desires; millions of others, feeling in their hearts it was gross and stupid and a nightmare of iniquity, fell in line and all the more because of their doubts turned to the task of enforcing uniformity in their communities. As our War Department put it,

> The selective draft went into nearly every home; and thus every citizen, feeling its incidence in his own family, was determined that others also should do their full duty. Every registrant's case became the subject of observation and discussion; his action, in claiming or not claiming deferment was well known; the neighbors knew the truth about his circumstances even if the [draft] board members might not, and the boards were surfeited with information—by visit and by letter, signed and unsigned. The most efficient detective force that the War Department could have organized would not have been more productive of information than were the neighbors in their scrutiny of the registrants.[19]

"Thousands of letters have been received by the various authorities," according to the report on the draft by the Provost Marshal General, "reporting alleged instances of failure to perform other duties under the selective service law." [20]

In every major combatant country the pressure was the same. Many commentators have expressed surprise that the number of those openly daring to challenge the authority of the war machine was so small. Small it was; hardly a blade of green grass in an illimitable forest. And yet, when considered against the extent of moral and physical compulsion the number of rebels was not small, nor small when viewed against the background of war objectors through history. The treatment of these men, terrible as it sometimes was, was less harsh than all of them anticipated. There was hardly one who had not faced within his own mind, at some stage or other, the possibility of a traitor's death.

The number of those in all the warring countries who stood out as avowed war objectors can never be known. In some countries where records were more painstakingly kept, a close approximation to accuracy is possible—especially in England, where the number was greatest and in the United States where it was not least. In each of these cases sympathetic and dependable studies have been made, and are drawn on heavily in what follows.[21]

1. *How many war objectors were there?* The number of actual conscientious objectors was very much smaller than the anti-war elements among all the people, for women and those over draft age cannot be estimated. The reluctance of the British Government to apply conscription and its open recognition, in the Parliament debates, of a strong public hostility to such measures, is in part an indication of a popular disapproval of the War, not among the people as a whole but certainly among more than a negligible minority.

In the United States there were large numbers of draft evaders; up to June 30, 1918, the Department of Justice had investigated 220,747 cases of failure to register and other forms of delinquency, resulting in the induction of 23,495

men. In New York City, between September third and sixth a spectacular and sometimes brutally stupid series of round-ups brought in 16,500 evaders. It must be remembered that in the tremendous number of evaders were many who misunderstood the Draft Act, and had no scruples against fighting; others who had no scruples about war but objected to fighting on selfish grounds or because their sense of allegiance to loved ones had too strong an appeal for them; a few others who objected sincerely to war but who were endowed with insufficiently robust nervous systems or with insufficiently meticulous ethics, to adopt the frankly open position of conscientious objection.

The War Department states that a total of 55,368 registrants professed adherence to non-combatant religious creeds. There were non-religious objectors, and some belonging to other than traditionally pacifist denominations. The total number of those claiming non-combatant classification was 64,693. Of these, the vast majority or 56,830 claims were recognized. Many were allowed to enter some form of non-combatant service: medical, sanitary, ambulance, or hospital work; engineering work; or occupations in the Quartermaster Corps. Some of the Inspirationists at Amana were permitted to go on with their work of manufacturing army blankets and other war supplies! On the whole, however, the pacifist sects held out fairly well, in spite of a minority in most of them who took up active combatant positions.

Those who got to camps totaled 3989. There were some who did not reach camp because they were put in deferred classifications for slight or serious physical defects. Of those in camp, 1300 "originally accepted or were assigned to non-combatant service";

> 1,200 were furloughed to agriculture and 99 to the Friends Reconstruction Unit in France, while 450 were sent to prison by courtsmartial. That is to say, after many difficulties and considerable suffering all but 450 objectors who went to camp finally found some form of service, satisfactory to the government, which they could render.[22]

In England, a carefully estimated total of 16,100 has been summarized as follows:[22]

Arrested	6261
Pelham Committee's cases	3964
[a committee established to advise the Tribunals]	
Friends' Ambulance Unit	1200
War Victims Relief Co.	200
Working directly under Tribunals	900
Non-Combatant Corps	3300
Royal Army Medical Corps	100
Evaded the Act	175
	16,100

Of the men who were arrested only 351 ultimately gave in and took combatant positions. Those who refused to accept any labor at all under military direction numbered at least 1350; these were the so-called Absolutists—a term full of unfortunate philosophical connotations, but, like "conscientious objection," adopted more or less impromptu amid the general inventive trend of the time, both in pacifist and military circles.

2. *What sort of people were the war objectors?* The bulk of them were members of non-violent religious sects or associations. In the majority of cases they belonged to one or another of the groups whose history has been sketchily referred to in this chapter. But there were new groups also. The great Russian, Leo Tolstoy, had made converts here and there in all the nations to his religious non-violence. In certain countries the Nazarenes constituted a serious obstacle to the militarist's *beau idéal* of a country mobilized to the last man. In Britain the Christadelphians and Plymouth Brethren rejected the bearing of arms but were able to accept non-combatant and sometimes even combatant service provided they were not required technically to carry a gun. In the United States the Russian Molokans from Arizona attracted respect and affection at their determined and kindly sufferance of hardship. Perhaps no organization of such radical character with regard to war ever attracted to its ranks so many intellectuals as the Fellowship of Reconciliation which won a place for itself in England and

the United States during the War and spread to many countries, everywhere exerting a unique influence. It was never recognized as having a valid place among the pacifist groups, and so its members subject to the draft received no tolerance; but they frequently lent steadfast power to the body of objectors as a whole.

With the World War a new type of objector arose. The growing radical labor movement produced a great many who did not follow the nationalist opportunism of the Socialist and Labor organizations in most of the belligerent countries. These Socialist objectors were occasionally believers in no war at all, on grounds of economic and political labor solidarity rather than religion; sometimes, in the United States at least, they would have fought in a class war against capitalist rule, but in an international conflict they would not support the government. If anyone desires to quarrel with this logic, let it not be that person who is against class war but believes every good citizen should come when his *country* calls! The political objectors were less than one-tenth of them all. Lieutenant Mark A. May, who conducted psychological examinations of objectors, has classified them as follows:

(1) Religious literalists, honest, sincere, but not possessed of broad social vision. "This type of man constitutes fully 75% of conscientious objectors."

(2) Religious idealists. "The problem with this type is not that he has not social vision, but that he has too much."

(3) The Socialist type. "Man likely to be well educated and very intelligent. He is well informed on the vital social and economic problems of the day. . . . His patriotism knows no national limits. The problem with him is that he entirely fails to appreciate national problems. He is not willing to fight the proletariat of Germany just to get at the ruling classes. He may even believe in the use of force and fighting, but it is capitalism and imperialism that he wants to fight.

But the classification here, while in the main it may be just, is still too simple. There were many who crossed these lines, and some who could not be labeled at all and had to be designated as "humanitarians."

In England the percentage of Socialist objectors was markedly greater. Whereas there were a goodly number of absolutist objectors among the English Friends, in the United States the Quaker absolutists were conspicuous for their almost entire absence. In *Conscription and Conscience,* John W. Graham attributes this in part to the more favorable type of non-combatant work offered to the American Friends. But not entirely:

> The difference was due to the fact that Friends in America are much more separate from the Socialist movement than is the case in England. Also there was no such body as the No Conscription Fellowship in America, binding all the men together.

The President's board of inquiry examined 1697 "C.O.'s" in regard to their sincerity. This was a task demanding more omniscience than any group of men could summon, as non-pacifist critics have pointed out; but all in all the board approached its task in a commendable spirit. Its report is summarized as follows:[24]

Found to be sincere entirely or in part	1461
Found insincere	103
Remanded for further inquiry	88
Remanded for examination as to mental deficiency	7
Otherwise disposed of	38

That the objectors were not cowards is obvious to anybody of intelligence who knows these men in person or the history of non-conformist pacifism. Though there were army officers who glibly put such an interpretation on their conduct, in accord with the popular ignorance, there were a large number of officers who had the penetration, wit and fairness to think otherwise. Professor Case cites many of them in his *Non-Violent Coercion.* Much has been made by pacifists of the fact that one objector was awarded a Carnegie medal for a drowning rescue at the moment when he was undergoing disciplinary punishment in Leavenworth. This was indeed a dramatic incident, but of far less significance than the willingness of the objectors to undergo public contumely of the extremest kind. Everyone who knows anything knows that physi-

cal courage is comparatively cheap and plentiful, and moral courage none too common.

That they were not low in the scale of general intelligence is proved—as much as anything is ever proved in such a way—by the results of psychological tests. Dr. Edward A. Lincoln, who applied to the C.O.'s in Leavenworth the same test as that used for the army, divided the subjects into three groups: religious, political, aliens. The religious objectors were found equal to the army average, the political objectors noticeably higher, and the alien objectors—ill adjusted as they were to such a situation—definitely lower. Dr. Lincoln's own words are striking:

> Conscientious objectors of the religious and political types are high grade men very distinctly above the other groups. This superiority is especially noticeable in the case of the political objectors.
>
> The men classed as conscientious objectors because of being alien enemies, having alien relatives, etc., are decidedly low in intelligence. This seems to be one group in the institution whose troubles may be ascribed to low mentality. The men in this group are largely foreign born, many could speak or understand very little English, and a large proportion of them were illiterate.
>
> A supplementary study was made of the conscientious objectors who have continually and consistently refused to do any work either before they came to the institution or afterwards. . . . The superiority of these men as a group to any other group in the institution is very apparent.[25]

Another and more extensive intelligence study by Professor (formerly Lieutenant) May resulted in the following significant table:[26]

	White Draft (94,000 *cases*) *Per Cent*	*Conscientious Objectors* (1000 *cases*) *Per Cent*
A Very Superior	4.1	8.7
B Superior	8.0	15.2
C+ High average	15.2	22.6
C Average	25.0	24.8
C— Low average	23.8	16.8
D Inferior	17.0	8.7
D— Very inferior	7.1	3.1

Another study of the tests revealed that "the religious objectors fell behind sergeants and members of officers' training corps; the political objectors were excelled only by officers; and of the political objectors the absolutists excelled the average for commissioned officers." [27]

It is a pity, however, that the government did not learn in time of the marvelous discovery made by one of the active spirits in a leading superpatriotic society. This ex-officer has worked out a set of charts proving (to his own satisfaction, which among all such patriots will assuredly be quite enough) that one's radicalism depends on the amount of iodine in his blood. Goiter, says this remorseless hound of truth, is prevalent in the districts where conscientious objectors were most numerous. How simple it would have been, then, to administer a few clinical treatments, and turn out for military leadership a fine two-fisted bunch of gladiators, not the feeble pacifists who, as a deceived draft board bitterly complained, were "physically fit beyond their fellows in the examination classes, intelligent beyond compare, and in every way constituted to develop into splendid fighting men." [28]

3. *How did the war objectors fare?* They fared worst, perhaps, in Austria-Hungary. Here a strong and vigorous anti-militarist movement had existed prior to the War, and hundreds of its members were thrown into prison, where they were often cruelly treated. As everywhere, a great deal depended on the kindliness or the ferocity of the jailors; but on the whole the record was bad. Protesting, anti-German regiments of Czechs joined in demonstrations with objectors to all war, and through these groups went the military monsters, shooting them down sometimes to the tune of one in every five. A movement of anti-conscriptionists of all types, as Principal Graham expresses it, "was extinguished in blood." In Hungary hundreds of peaceable Nazarenes were executed or shot down summarily, their homes devastated. They were offered, if anything at all, a sort of non-combatant service of the most discriminatory character. There were several thousand objectors imprisoned or tortured or killed.

In Germany only a handful refused service, and while there were rumors of shooting, these have never been proved. A favorite method was to declare the pacifist a lunatic—a very neat device quite in keeping with the eminent sanity and poise of a war-minded society, and a practice by no means confined to Germany. Witness Buckinjehillish!

Likewise in France the problem of the conscientious objector was not serious; but nevertheless there were pacifists who were clapped into prison and later deported to the infamous Devil's Island in French Guiana, whence some have not yet been able to return; for even when sentences of such offenders expire, the government does not provide funds for them to come home on, and the means of earning more than the most miserable livelihood are not available.

The Tsar's government always had a vexing question on its hands with the pacifist religious bodies which for many years had lived within its domains. Though in general war objectors were sent to prison for many years at hard labor, one sensational trial of seventeen youthful Tolstoyans resulted in their liberation. When the Bolsheviks came into power, they adopted a very humane and enlightened attitude toward the war objector, even exempting some cases of absolute objection. But with the death of Lenin a less tolerant view has had the ascendancy, and to-day the Russian pacifist fares less well than his fellows in many a monarchical and capitalistic state.

While the British sentences were light in comparison to the ferocious terms handed out to political pacifists and violators of the Espionage Act in the United States, the treatment of objectors was at times severe. It fell most heavily, of course, upon the so-called absolutists. Thirty-four men were shipped to France, in order that for a refusal of military service there they might be shot. Only the feverish activity of the No-Conscription Fellowship, together with a hasty interview by Professor Gilbert Murray with Premier Asquith, prevented the executions. A bit of insight into the spirit of these objec-

tors is given in a letter written by one of those anticipating his end:

> I expect that my comrades at liberty are agitated by the news of our probable fate, but I suggest that they do not devote all their efforts to procuring our release. Remember that the ideals of patriotism and militarism are surrounded with the glamour of self-sacrifice which the heroism of innumerable soldiers has cast upon them. Sacrifice hallows our cause. I suggest, therefore, that you concentrate some of your thoughts in encouragement of the complete service to our ideal, so that when the final hour arrives we shall be nerved to endure, and then the principle of International Fraternity will be placed on an equal footing to the prejudice of patriotism.

Cold cells; four days in a pit containing two feet of water; being put into a bag and thrown eight times into a pond, to be pulled out each time by a gripping rope; starvation; standing, stripped, in unsanitary cells; beatings—these were only some of the refinements of British militarism employed to break men's wills.[29] Under this stress it is not to be wondered at that the deaths of many were directly attributable to the tortures of their situation, especially due to the practice of repeated resentencing.

The policy of the United States government was singularly inconsistent. On the face of it, the treatment provided by the President's proclamations was not only moderate but extremely liberal. Yet toward the numerous political objectors in particular who were arrested and put behind bars, as for example Eugene V. Debs, Mr. Wilson was spitefully vindictive and Secretary of War Baker curiously unconcerned—failing in this to approximate the military leaders themselves in England or the Liberal and Coalition governments. President Wilson had pledged the people that there would be "no conscription of the unwilling," but the registration blanks provided no spaces on which to ask exemption unless the claimant belonged to a recognized pacifist sect. And as the objectors reached camp and found themselves faced with efforts to persuade, then to coerce, them to put on the uniform, they began to experience in many cases a brutality that for a

time was unchecked by Washington. Secretary Baker had promised there would not be such cruelties as those vented on the C.O.'s in England, but he needed considerable prodding to take steps toward prevention of treatment which in certain places was as bad and possibly worse. Finally, government intervention came; it was undoubtedly sincere, and not illiberal. But it came too late.

Men were beaten; they had their eyes gouged to the point of severe injury; they were stripped and scrubbed with brooms; they were plunged for long periods under cold showers when previously exhausted from forced useless labor; they were prodded with bayonets; they were dragged through latrines; they were chained, in solitary confinement, to the doors of their cells for nine hours a day; they were subjected to a stream of water from a firehose held directly against their faces for two hours at a time; as one of the Russian Molokans stated it simply, in a letter:

> They dragged me like an animal with a rope round my neck. They shaved my head. They cut my ears. They tore my shirt to pieces and wanted to put me in a uniform. I did not count how many times they beat me. They pulled the hairs off my head like feathers. I was motionless. I only prayed God to take me from this world of horrors.

To what end was such bestiality perpetrated? As a report laconically says, "The Russians did not yield to torture."

There is little use to describe the torments of "the Hole" at Alcatraz Island, or the other dungeons in which men lost their health and their minds. For after all, war is no game of pleasure, and he who fights against it must take his medicine as do those who fight, unwittingly, for its perpetuation. Against the method which through conscription drives into trenches and into prisons men who do not want to go, we must wage our fight for peace, not too mindful of our sacrifices and our casualties.

4. *What did the war objectors accomplish?* The answer is not yet. But certain things are clear.

They demonstrated the possibility of a fidelity to vision and

principle under strenuous compulsion. In this, their accomplishment was nothing new under the sun. Yet it is something in the midst of a compromising, soul-selling society, materialistic if any age has ever been, to know that there are men who cannot be forced to violate the spiritual pact they have made with life.

They carried on the torch of pacifist illumination which has been tended by faithful hands in nearly every generation of world history. Truth, crushed to earth, may rise again; but not if buried. Just as the debt of present-day pacifists is incalculably great to those whose practice of non-violence has shown the way in the past, so shall pacifists of the future be grateful to those who stood faithful in this bitter time.

They have directly opposed to the path of conscription the rights of conscience. It is not necessary to prove that conscience is divine or infallible to hold that the state is in a dangerous position when it coerces everyone into a complete uniformity of action. Against this suicidal error of social organization the conscientious objector, and the thoroughgoing objector in particular, interposes the claims of a moral principle which should be, he contends, inviolate. As Professor Case is compelled to conclude, "It seems clear that when the social group conscripts a man for any purpose which requires a violation of his conscience it really demands that he destroy his own moral life." In the words of a British objector:

> This country is faced with the most insidious danger that can confront a free people in the claim of the State to dispose of a man's life against his will, and what is worse, against his moral convictions, and of his service without his consent.[30]

They forced the pacifist method of social progress upon the attention of thousands who had never heard or thought of it. Not all of these were permanently hostile. During the debates over deprivation of objectors' citizenship rights in Parliament, a soldier, Captain Gwynne, declared, on June 26, 1917:

> I am not at all sure that these people, whom we propose to reject as the outcasts of the State, may not be the best people to

help in the fight to make an end of war. There is one thing that nobody can deny them, and that is courage, the most difficult form of courage in the world, the courage of the individual against the crowd. . . . That is a courage which, above all others, makes for freedom.

There were many who came to feel in the same way or somewhat similarly. Professor Case, who writes as no special pleader, declares in his Preface that "the study reflects a twofold evolution, the one having taken place in the progress of objective events in the world of affairs, the other in the changing point of view brought about in my own thought by the study of these facts." Many of the most active workers and leaders in the present peace societies of the United States are veterans who frankly profess their debt to the war objectors whose sturdy courage compelled their reconsideration of the whole war question. That some such process is possible on a fairly general scale, at least in limited areas, is seen in the election in 1929 of twenty-nine radical pacifists to Parliament by substantial votes, following a sporadic growth of political support for numerous pacifists in earlier post-War contests.

Labor in England, whether it fully realizes it or not, has gained its greatest drive for peace tactics from the group of those who went through the War as pacifists. Just so have the churches, in the United States and in England, found in the example of the war objectors a constant spur to more vigorous peace action and an ever-present reminder of a high task as yet but weakly undertaken. The more pacifistic after-War resolutions, whether voted or merely proposed and rejected, are an evidence of this.

They have already cast a shadow across the path of the war-making authorities which is foreboding and which presages a more serious obstacle in the event of another upthrust from hell. They have paved the way for gigantic demonstrations, since the War, of hundreds of thousands who have pledged themselves openly, defiantly, against all participation in the entirely possible "next war." Such an achievement could never have been wrought but for the memory of those who would not

bargain with their convictions, who affirm that "the Right is the Right after all." As Norman Thomas has tellingly said:

> This insignificant fraction of the youth of America challenged the power of the state when it was mightiest and the philosophy of war when it was most pervasive. They said, "You may kill us but you can't make us fight against our will." They said it not as men who court martyrdom but as men who serve principle; not as those who despised the state but as those who refused to make it God. . . .
>
> The fact that the government was forced to treat with these men at all, that it dared not kill them and could not force them to kill is a significant precedent. In this war the objectors were few. But the memory of their defiance may some day help to break the spell which holds the patient masses like dumb, driven cattle in obedience to the financiers and diplomats for whose intrigues they pay with their lives under the grip of "the homicidal mania men call patriotism." [31]

"The objectors were few." But another time they will be multiplied and strengthened; and before that time their voices are being raised in a mighty shout that must be heeded. They are not done; and their spirit is one which bids war makers beware.

CHAPTER XXIV

THE NEWER PEACE DYNAMICS

A custom which is quite necessary at one stage may block the advance to a higher stage, and if conditions are arising which make that advance possible, society will gain by its removal. The fact that a custom rests on the requirements of social life does not render it inviolable in cases where those requirements have altered.—L. T. HOBHOUSE, *Morals in Evolution* (Henry Holt and Co.).

CHAPTER XXIV

THE NEWER PEACE DYNAMICS

THERE was every reason to expect that when the War was over, conscientious objection was over also. A war objector in time of peace was something of an anomaly. After previous wars, the handful of dissenters faded out of sight into accustomed occupations and the war objector was heard from no more. Either that, or they organized into societies for the promotion of peace or else worked through existing agencies. In all probability that was what this time the governments and the military expected.

But that was not what happened. There were those who did all this; but there were more who sought out places where they could work directly for the transformation of the social order. The ranting of the anti-pacifist alarmists has this much real foundation: all through the professions which enable them to reach the ears of people, young and old, have gone these war-tried pacifists not to spread an unthinking, propagandist pacifism but to make those whom they might influence think their own way through the place of modern war in the lives of men, or even more, the place of men in modern war.

But there was more. There was a permanence about this pacifism that had not been known before. The men and women who from inside and outside prison had fought against the War found in the rapidly growing youth movements all around the world a ready response to their thoroughgoing pacifism. These movements in many places have begun to die, as all good men and movements must; and in some others as in the United States, they hardly came alive. But from their ranks have emerged some of the most determined and most thoughtful fighters in the struggle to abolish war.

This time the number was too large to fade away in the aftermath of the War; too large, too well informed, too saturated with the social point of view. Organization became imperative. From England and the English war objectors came the impetus which formed the War Resisters' International. This movement is an association of affiliated societies in twenty-one countries, building fraternity among them, coming to the aid of the ever-present victims of conscription, and developing the philosophy and practice of war resistance.

Already a noticeable change is evident in the radical pacifist approach to war. Only uncommonly and usually then in retrospect do we hear of conscientious objectors. "War resisters" is the current term. And in this change of words is implicit the change of thought which has been going on. War resistance is vigorous, positive, on the initiative and alert. It carries with it the connotations of an action-program, looking with hope toward definite accomplishment. And in the last analysis it is preventive, directed not alone to what may happen if war comes, but what may now be undertaken to prevent its coming.

A Mighty Chorus

But not only is war resistance based to-day on a somewhat new ambition. It is an international movement. Weak as it is in funds and prestige, the movement of war resisters has stretched its hands across the seas and drawn its members into a circle of fellowship. The leadership, through the international conferences, has become a leadership of friends; it has emerged to some extent as the sociologists' face-to-face group, with the greater depth of understanding thus involved. The war resister of New Zealand can know the hardships endured by his comrades in Finland or Russia, and the French war resister goes to prison knowing that all around the world like-minded friends are aware of his suffering.

Here indeed is a new and vital situation of great emotional significance. There is a sustaining power in such a spiritual unity that partakes of the aid to morale someone has called a "moral uniform." In conscript Europe the number of

prisoners who have been jailed for refusal of military service has averaged about four hundred known cases most of the time since the War, and while it has been of course impossible to establish personal contact with all these men, the knowledge of a sympathetic group the world around has brought mental comfort to many of them, held as they are sometimes incommunicado or occasionally even subject to torture. The War Resisters' International has published some of the letters received from these pacifists, and they bespeak a transparent nobility in the men who write them.[1] No more bitter indictment could be returned against our civilization than the bald fact that men like these can be kept confined for conscience' sake.

In Holland, Roumania, Poland, Switzerland, France, Czechoslovakia and Soviet Russia, the way of the pacifist young men is thorny. Even in progressive New Zealand, where an act is in force for compulsory military training of youth, as many as two thousand boys a year have been convicted of refusal to accept the drill.

The closeness of contact between the various war resisters' groups is not all that may be hoped for; the difficulties in the path of such a world fraternity are enormous. And yet with every allowance for the all but rudimentary growth that has thus far been manifested, the genuine internationalism of the movement cannot be gainsaid. Here are the forty societies of the War Resisters' International:[2]

Austria:
- Bund der Kriegsdienstgegner Oesterreichs (Union of Austrian War Resisters)
- Bund Herrschaftsloser Sozialisten (Union of Anarcho-Socialists)
- Tolstoi-Bund (Tolstoi Union)

Australia:
- Women's International League (Melbourne)

Belgium:
- War Resisters' Group—Antwerp Section
- War Resisters' Group—Brussels Section

Bulgaria:
War Resisters Group

Czechoslovakia:
Movado por Kristana Komunismo (Movement for Christian Communism)

Denmark:
Verdenskrigens Veteraner
War Resisters' Group

England:
No More War Movement
The Young Anto-Militarists

Finland:
Finland's Obetingade Fredsvänner (Finland's Unconditional Friends of Peace)
Suomen Antimilitaristinen Liitto (Finland's Antimilitarist League)

France:
Section du Sud-Est—Lyon Group
Drôme-Ardèche Section
La Volonté de Paix—Levallois-Perret (The Will to Peace)
Mouvement Pacifique Chrétien
La Ligue des Réfractaires (League of Resisters)

Germany:
Bund der Kriegsdienstgegner (Union of War Resisters)
Grossdeutsche Volksgemeinschaft (Great German People's Fellowship)

Holland:
Bond van religieuse Anarcho-Communisten (Union of Religious Anarcho-Communists)

Hungary:
Hungarian Youth

Ireland:
War Resisters' Group (Dublin)
Women's International League (Dublin)

Italy:
Group

New Zealand:
- Fellowship of Reconciliation
- National Peace Council
- No More War Movement

Poland:
- War Resisters' Group

Roumania:
- Le Premier Groupe Humanitariste de Bucarest (First Humanitarian Group)

Russia:
- Bratski Trud (Commune of Fraternal Labor—Ukraine)
- War Resisters' Group (Moscow)

Sweden:
- Svenska Krigstjänsvägrar-Forgundet (Swedish Union of War Resisters)

Switzerland:
- Groupe Romand des Réfractaires—Le Locle (War Resisters' Group)
- Jugendgemeinschaft "Nie Wieder Krieg"—Zürich (No More War Youth Fellowship)

United States:
- Fellowship of Reconciliation
- War Resisters' League
- Women's Peace Society
- Women's Peace Union

General:
- Individual Members and Correspondents in many countries on all continents.

This list is taken from the literature of the War Resisters' International. It reveals that the national sections of certain international organizations vary greatly in their attitude toward war resistance. The American Fellowship of Reconciliation is affiliated but the British is not; the Australian Women's International League is affiliated but the American is not. Many of the organizations listed are very weak. On the other hand, so engrossed in their own difficulties are the radical pacifist groups in numerous places that this list conveys no accurate

measure of those all around the world who are unreservedly opposed to war.

The viewpoint of the War Resisters' International is upheld by at least fifteen periodicals, some of them substantial and influential, in thirteen countries. With individual members in no fewer than fifty-three countries, it is necessary for the W.R.I. headquarters to carry on its correspondence in fourteen different languages. Those who may be inclined to dismiss this movement as negligible merely because they know little or nothing about it, would receive a surprise if they should read a booklet by H. Runham Brown, Secretary of the W.R.I. (in whose mind the project chiefly took first form), entitled breezily, for popular perusal and to indicate effectiveness, *Cutting Ice.* In 1926 Dr. Hans Wehberg, the distinguished authority on international law, declared:

> Outside the Peace Movement, the idea of war resistance has made astonishing progress. As an impartial observer who has still many an objection against the form of war resisters' propaganda made in peace circles, I have to admit, this Movement is on the way and seems likely to conquer the world sooner or later. Woe to the Governments, woe to the representatives of international law, should they continue to withhold their sympathy from this Movement.

While in 1929 he added:

> The conviction that in a war which is illegal according to international law, individuals have the right and duty to refuse war service, is growing everywhere.

Professor Mendelssohn-Bartholmy, of Hamburg, has also said:

> After the ratification of the Paris Pact, Governments will no longer be able to impose war service on their citizens.

Irrespective of the precise ultimate force exerted by the Pact on international affairs, these expressions of opinion result from the existence of a strong ground swell among the masses.

Of a strong proletarian character is the International Anti-militaristic Commission, consisting of the International Workingmen's Association and the International Anti-Militaristic

Bureau. It reaches many working-class leaders throughout the world with its news and rallying efforts, and it is strongly pacifist.

The International Fellowship of Reconciliation has sought to further the principles of Jesus amidst the conflict-problems of the world, and as a solvent for those problems, is organized in twenty-six countries. All of these sections, while varying in social philosophy from generally radical to generally conservative, are united in their refusal to sanction war.

Thus it can hardly be denied that the world is ringed by a movement which, though as yet not wholly united, is strong enough to establish in most places a nucleus of war resistance. The total number is impossible to estimate; but including those of all ages, it is certain that the war-resisting pacifists of the world to-day must be counted in hundreds of thousands.

To take one illustration. Lord Ponsonby, a member of the Labor Cabinet and an experienced statesman, offered to his countrymen a drastic Peace Letter to the Prime Minister. The text of this striking document was as follows:

Sir,

We, the undersigned, convinced that all disputes between nations are capable of settlement either by diplomatic negotiation or by some form of International Arbitration, hereby solemnly declare that we shall refuse to support or render war service to any Government which resorts to arms.

The Peace Letter, bearing the signatures of 128,770 persons, all British citizens above the age of sixteen years, was presented to Prime Minister Baldwin on December 8, 1927. In an accompanying letter of explanation Lord Ponsonby pointed out that "the number of signatories only represent those whom a single individual without any organization or large fund behind him, and with very little outside assistance, has been able to approach by meetings or by correspondence. My difficulty has been not to get people to sign, but to reach the great multitude who want to sign. I am confident that these 128,770 represent a far larger number."

Lord Ponsonby said further:

Instead of framing resolutions or petitions for presentation to Ministers, Government or Parliament, the idea was to allow each individual with his conscience as his guide to express his or her opinion with regard to war as a method of attempting to settle international disputes. With the unforgettable memory of the Great War in their minds, with the recollection of its episodes and with the presence around them of its baneful consequences both at home and abroad, the signatories desire to register not only their detestation of the senseless barbarity of war, but their determination not to participate on any pretext whatever in another international conflict. . . .

The people are the agents as well as the victims in war. Without their willing coöperation war cannot be waged. By the refusal of a large section of them the war card will be withdrawn from the hands of governments, the menace of force will be removed, international disputes will be settled by civilized methods of negotiation and arbitration.

The Peace Letter idea has resulted in a large number of somewhat similar declarations in several countries. While the prevailing conservatism of the peace forces in the United States has prevented a wide acceptance of this method, such declarations have attracted new members in considerable numbers to the small groups which have pushed them—people who do not desire to substitute a "pledge" for action, but who believe that an open declaration of this character puts them in a frank and effective position of utter non-coöperation with war.[3] In Germany upwards of 250,000 people signed an almost identical Peace Letter after a brief campaign by the war resisters' groups.

While it is recognized by everybody that adherence to a statement of this character cannot guarantee adherence to its corollary action under the pressure of war, there is reason to believe that of these thousands a fair percentage would hold firm. The ability of large groups of ordinary people to maintain a non-violent war resistance is not entirely theoretical, as the later portions of this chapter will prove. The signatures to such Peace Letters mean far more than fifty-five thousand signatures to the anti-war statement of Elihu Burritt's League of Universal Brotherhood almost a century before; this

time, in a new war, practically every signer must be either a combatant or a jailbird at the very least—*unless* the presence of so determined, so fearless, so impregnable a group, acting in full solidarity, should cause an actual breakdown in the war machinery.

That such an eventuality is something more than a fantastic dream will be understood if the skeptic contemplates the character of modern industrialized society. Our War Department knows what the peace societies often overlook: "War is no longer a matter of foraging troops and an assortment of rifles and bayonets, but demands the organization of the whole Nation into a fighting team." [4]

Dr. Arthur D. Little, a renowned chemist, in 1928 elected President of the Society of Chemical Industry in London, an American who aided the War by research, has this to say in a recent book: "In the same measure that our present civilization exceeds in complexity the primitive life of the savage do the requirements of modern warfare bring new demands which strain all the resources of that civilization, and may even, as we have witnessed, strain them beyond the breaking point." [5] From Dr. Little's research I excerpt the following illuminating statement:

> It was not immediately obvious that the success of a gas-mask programme might hinge on the supply of coconut shells from which to make absorbent charcoal. Only recently has the atmosphere become our most reliable source of nitrates. Seaweed might be regarded as a negligible resource from the military standpoint, but the war called into being at San Diego a vast plant producing from Pacific kelps iodine, potash, and a whole series of organic solvents required in the powder manufacture. The mitsumata plant, from the bark of which the Japanese make their paper, is less belligerent than a humming bird, but it contributed the 3,000,000 paper parachutes with which our star shells were provided. Nearly 500,000 Chinese Nuchwang dogs gave up their hides and fur to keep our aviators warm, and millions of Australian rabbits "went west" because their furry coats were needed to make the hats our soldiers wore. We do not go to a gun store for bird seed but bird seed is none the less a military supply. The Signal Corps trained 15,000 carrier pigeons for service in France,

and tons of Argentine corn, pop corn, millet and Canada peas were shipped to feed them.

"To a layman like myself" exclaims Dr. Little, "it begins to be apparent that any consideration of the relation of raw materials to military supplies involves some extension of commonly accepted notions as to what military supplies really are." Here are just a few of the relevant facts he brings out in his careful study:

The catalog of army supplies in 1919 listed 120,000 separate items.

By Armistice Day, 8,000 factories in the United States were working on ordnance contracts.

The estimated total cost of ordnance alone for 5,000,000 soldiers was nearly $13,000,000,000—a sum to be expended at a rate which would build a Panama Canal every month.

It took 4000 inspectors for the factories making government garments.

We purchased over 800,000,000 square yards of cotton textiles, enough so that if it were laid out in one-yard widths 55 globes the size of the earth could be placed upon it.

As many as 150 plants were manufacturing webbing.

Army shirts required in one year 216,000,000 buttons. They were made from ivory nuts, and the waste product left over was made into charcoal for gas masks.

The brass bands required 200,000 sheets of music and 143,000 instruments.

Fifty-nine factories in this country were required to go at top speed to turn out the 9,250,000 brushes needed, and bristles had to be imported from China, India, Russia and Siberia.

Safety-razor blades to the tune of 45,000,000 were only a minor item of supply.

One item of medical care alone called for 300,000,000 tubes of iodine-potassium.

Sixty-five tons of surgical instruments were shipped overseas in a single month.

Preëminent as we are in the steel industries, all the facilities of the country before the war were inadequate to realize the gun-building programme. It takes ten months to make a fourteen-inch gun, the normal life of which is 150 shots.

The Union Army at Gettysburg fired 32,781 rounds. The United States troops at St. Mihiel fired over 1,000,000 rounds and the British at the Somme 4,000,000.

The ordinary service cartridge consists of a brass cartridge case, a primer with a primer charge of sulphur, chlorate of potash, and antimony sulphide, a propelling charge of smokeless powder, which refers at once to cotton and the fixation of atmospheric nitrogen, and finally, a bullet with a cupro-nickel jacket and a lead slug or core. The production, therefore, of this single small object involves our reserves of copper, zinc, nickel, lead, and antimony among the metals; the Louisiana or Texas sulphur deposits; potash, as to which we were experiencing a famine; water power to convert by electrolysis potassium chloride to the chlorate; and finally, cotton linters, sulphuric and nitric acids, various organic solvents, and even the fixation of atmospheric nitrogen.

If you are a believer in the war method as the final resort, you can hardly be blamed for insisting on industrial preparedness. If you are a believer in peace as the last resort, you can hardly be blamed for a rising wonder as to how much irreconcilable war opposition a war-making power can stand and still have its war. More than ever, infinitely more than ever, is it true that

> War's a game which, were their subjects wise,
> Kings would not play at.

The Strike for Peace

"War is murder. When the workers defy the call of the Governments to murder each other, there will be No More War." That was Keir Hardie, British Labor pioneer.

Here and there the voice of labor has been raised in strong condemnation of war; in fact the history of the socialist movement has been fairly consistent in its opposition to war and even violence in retaliation for the vastly greater violence of the propertied classes.[8] Not until the World War and the shameful surrender to nationalism did the socialists of the world entirely yield to the siren's cries. The early Utopian socialists stressed peaceful social change. Marxian socialism was born in a period of revolutions and its doctrinaire reliance on force is evident to-day in the communism of the Third International. Fabian socialism, a later development, emphasized gradual,

peaceable methods. Thus present-day socialism, while on the whole active in urging peace tactics internationally and especially in assailing the economic causes of war, is divided on the issue of class war or even on international war as a final resort. The Marxian type centers in Russian communism and the Fabian type in British socialism; while in between there are many gradations, varying from *bona fide* pacifism to an entirely opportunist view—such as that held by American non-socialist labor under the leadership of recent years.

On at least one occasion an American labor union refused entirely to sanction the military method. Militiamen were excluded from membership in the Painters' and Decorators' Union of Schenectady in 1903. The action resulted in an injunction brought to stop this sinful practice, and numerous ministers—among them the well known Rev. Newman Smyth of New Haven—broke out in a cold sweat and branded the union as "treasonable," "against the flag," and "against the government." Whereupon a union spokesman replied:

> A battlefield to me has all the horrors of hell, and I can conceive of no kind of justification that will permit me and justify me in taking the life of my fellowmen. I cannot do it and I will not do it at anyone's behest. Our love of human kind is not restricted by the accidental geographical boundaries of any State, or of any country.
>
> That is the attitude of enlightened trade unionists toward the militia, and if it squares with our friend's idea of correct modes of living [referring to a statement by Dr. Smyth] to prefer to give to a professional killer of men, a man who engages in the business of killing men and accepts pay for it—if it is in accordance with his ideas of the teachings of Christ to give preference to such a man over one who is opposed to killing his fellowmen, then I say that I do not agree with his idea of Christianity. . . . I never studied theology, but I extend the right hand of fellowship and congratulate that body of workingmen who can rise superior to our modern mock patriotism that sets men at one another's throats.

Workmen in their organizations in Europe had discussed the general strike for peace before the World War of 1914. In Austria, after the outbreak of conflict, a general strike against

the war was urged by Pierre Ramus, editor of the brave paper, *Wohlstand für Alle* (Welfare for All).

The general strike idea is far from new. It was a favorite concept of French syndicalism for a time; Aristide Briand warmly upheld it before he went back on his radical connections. Glasgow laborers as long as 1833 endorsed the general strike to seize economic power:

> There will not be insurrection; it will simply be passive resistance. The men may remain at leisure; there is and can be no law to compel men to work against their will. They may walk the streets or fields with their arms folded, they will wear no swords, carry no muskets; they will present no multitude for the riot act to disperse. . . .[7]

The strike, as a rule astonishingly free from workers' violence, has been the weapon by which labor has achieved its conquests. The general strike, until recently, has been conceived of not to prevent war but to carry labor into the seats of the mighty. In his *Labor and Internationalism* Lewis L. Lorwin describes the growth of this plan from 1891 to 1907, at which time a resolution was finally passed by the Second International as follows:

> If a war threatens to break out, it is the duty of the working class in the countries concerned and of their parliamentary representatives with the aid of the International Socialist Bureau to do all in their power to prevent war by all means which seem to them appropriate and which naturally vary according to the sharpness of the class struggle and the general political situation.

After a strong appeal by Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg a paragraph was added to the resolution:

> Should war, none the less, break out, it is their duty to cooperate to bring it promptly to a close and to utilize the economic and political crisis created by the war to arouse the masses of the people and to precipitate the downfall of capitalist domination.

But this resolution as a whole was seen to be inconclusive, and at the 1910 congress in Copenhagen an attempt by direct

mention to adopt the general strike against war as socialist policy was made by Keir Hardie, Edward Vaillant and Jean Jaurès, but "they got no further," as Dr. Lorwin says, "than a vote to refer the matter to the International Socialist Bureau." It is clear that the breakdown of socialist opposition to war in 1914 was not due alone to temporary pressure but also to hesitancy and a lack of sound peace ideology in the socialist program for social change.

Increasingly since the War the general strike for peace has again entered into the discussions of war-prevention tactics. In the great labor conference of the International Federation of Trade Unions at the Hague in 1922 a resolution was adopted in favor of a general strike to prevent any war between nations. The Third Ordinary Congress of the I.F.T.U. at Vienna in 1924 declared that

> It is the duty of the working class, organized nationally and internationally, to resist war in the most energetic way by stopping the manufacture of arms and munitions, by effecting an economic blockade, and by declaring the international general strike.

The British Labor Party at its Margate conference in 1926 passed a strong war-resistance resolution, committing the party to a refusal to bear arms or make or transport munitions. Representatives of a million and a half miners in the International Miners' Congress at Geneva in 1920 declared for war resistance. At Rome, two years later, a similar declaration was made by the International Trade Union Congress, representing 24,000,000 workers. Again, war resistance was endorsed by the 1924 conference of the International Textile Workers at Vienna, representing 1,500,000 members. Eight hundred thousand workers were represented at the 1926 German Trade Union Congress at Breslau. Following on the Margate conference of British Labor, the Independent Labor Party of 50,000 members came out for war resistance at Whitley Bay. At Belfast, the British Coöperative Congress representing 5,000,000 members, did the same. Likewise, the Australian Labor Party. The Labor and Socialist International has en-

dorsed war resistance in countries which have been unwilling to trust arbitration.

When war between Great Britain and China seemed imminent in 1927, thirty thousand members of the Independent Labor Party served notice on the government that in the event of war they would refuse all coöperation. Can it be conceivable that such an action has no effect on policy? In England also war-resistance resolutions have been adopted as part of their programs by the Coöperative Women's Guilds, and the national conference of labor women in 1927; nearly 500,000 British women in 1927, all told, endorsed war resistance.

On many a group apart from labor the war-resistance movement has been making impact. The Twenty-third International Peace Congress at Berlin in 1924 voted in favor of protection for war resisters, and while the Congress of the following year rescinded this stand by a narrow margin, in 1926 it was restored; war resistance, too, in the case of peoples whose governments had refused to arbitrate, was upheld. In 1926, also, war resistance was endorsed by the French National Peace Congress at Valence, and by the German National Peace Kartell at Berlin. Two hundred British Congregational ministers in the same year formed a group pledged to resist war, while in Switzerland and Holland were organized movements of anti-militarist clergymen favoring war resistance.

Runham Brown's *Cutting Ice,* which publishes these dependable facts, further relates how, in 1928, the International Union of Anti-Militarist Clergymen was founded, establishing its headquarters in Holland; while the Peace Union of German Catholics attacked conscription and a group of German Catholic youth entered the War Resisters' International. These are definite changes and growths, but behind all these is the indubitable rise of a universal interest, among determined anti-war circles, in the war resistance method.

The idea is spreading throughout the world, the United States being almost alone in its general imperviousness. There exist numerous obstacles to the growth of a similar movement

in every country; and yet it is hard to point to any obstacles which are not susceptible of circumvention or removal.

H. G. Wells has gone so far as to say that

> There is a plain present need for the organization now, before war comes again, of an open and explicit refusal to serve in any war—or at most to serve in war, directly or indirectly, only after the issue has been fully and fairly submitted to arbitration. The time for a conscientious objection to war service is manifestly before and not after the onset of war.[8]

Wells is proposing an Open Conspiracy, as he calls it, a drive of modernized religion, utilizing science to the utmost, to banish suffering due to economic exploitation of man by man and to erect the world community in which war can be no more. What he says of his Open Conspiracy as a whole is true of the massed war resistance which is a central feature of it. "It is not necessarily antagonistic to any existing government. The Open Conspiracy is a creative organizing movement and not an anarchistic one." It is not a mad search for an ascetic ecstasy of pain:

> It is no part of the modern religion to incur needless hardship or to go out of the way to seek martyrdom. If we can do our work easily and happily so it should be done. But the work is not to be shirked because it cannot be done easily and happily. The vision of a world at peace and liberated for an unending growth of knowledge and power is worth every danger of the way. And since in this age of confusion we must live imperfectly and anyhow die, we may as well suffer if need be, and die for a great end as for none. Never has the translation of vision into realities been easy since the beginning of human effort. The establishment of the world community will surely exact a price—and who can tell what that price may be?—in toil, suffering and blood.

It is worth pausing for a moment to inquire whether the impulse toward a strike for peace must be left entirely to progressive labor. Is it unthinkable that the great religious bodies of the world, for example the followers of Jesus, who made the principle of non-violent love so central in his teaching, should move toward a repudiation of the smaller loyalties on behalf of the larger? New pacifist religious groups have sprung up

or grown during the last century, such as the Baha'i, the Nazarenes, the Tolstoyans, and numerous others more or less definitely orgainzed. Is there a reasonable chance that at last a Christian International may be born, to use the leverage of its vast organized power against the divisive hatreds of war? Such a possibility, one must admit, is merely speculative; of the churches' potency, once aroused to war resistance, there can be no question.

Whether it be through the strike for peace or by massed war resistance with the jails filling as men are seized at their jobs, a high degree of solidarity is essential. Human beings can hardly face the pressure of war in any effective numbers unless they are disciplined in personal and group morale. And that is why, since labor is already organized and in many parts of the world possesses solidarity, there is not a little basis for hope that under far-sighted leadership the workers may lay increasingly heavy hands upon the bridles of the world's war-horses.

The Fight for Justice

Roosevelt the nationalist and Lenin the Marxian were alike in their placing of peace in a subsidiary position with regard to justice. Neither one realized how seldom war fails to bury justice so deep that even its ghost is absent from the feasting of war-made tyrants. Neither could see any chance of victory by non-violent methods.

To the Arbitration and Peace Congress of 1907 the exponent of bull moose methods wrote, as if with worried wrinkles in his brow:

> First and foremost, I beseech you to remember that though it is our bounden duty to work for peace, yet it is even more our duty to work for righteousness and justice. It is "Righteousness that exalteth a nation," and tho normally peace is the handmaid of righteousness, yet, if they are ever at odds, it is righteousness whose cause we must espouse.

Lenin frequently expatiated upon the folly of refusing to use violence when it was "necessary" to the attainment of justice for the proletariat. Though they were far apart in their

judgment of economic and social values there was in this respect a great similarity between the defender of nationalistic capitalism and the protagonist of world revolution.

The innovator, wrong though he often proves to be, is the savior of civilization, for there can be no growth without change. "A real world peace movement," says Mr. Wells, in an article dealing harshly with the peace societies, "must be a revolutionary movement, in politics, finance, industrialism, and the daily life alike. It is not a proposed change in certain formal aspects of life; it is a proposal to change the whole of life."

Now war refusal alone can never do all that. But pacifism can; for pacifism is a way of life, a method of social change. It ramifies throughout the human universe; wherever it touches it profoundly leavens the relations of all persons with all others. It remakes personalities and releases a new spirit within groups. It is the silver hammer which, as the proverb has it, will break an iron door.

But war refusal is akin to the non-violent resistance that can repel invasion, set at nought the plots of conquerors and wear down with its iconoclasm the unimaginative minds of war idolators. It is akin to the non-violent attack that can rap the glass to insure a new precipitate of right; that can tumble down old wrongs and rottenness which, as Carlyle said, hold together amazingly well until someone handles them roughly; that can conquer hearts and minds instead of corpses.

How Non-Violence Works

No reader need expect from this book an attempt to prove that on the basis of concrete historic cases non-violent methods of hastening social change can invariably succeed. No such proof is necessary. War often fails, even in the eyes of its supporters, to accomplish useful ends. All that pacifism has to do is to show that it can succeed as often as war, that when it succeeds or fails it leaves less blood and tears upon the ground, that it sows fewer dragons' teeth to spring up as new conflicts in the future.

Nevertheless, the practice of non-violent resistance or attack is not wholly in the realm of fancy. A few cases will serve, if not for evidence, as stimuli to the imagination. And until there is a widespread ability to imagine one's self in a new situation, there can be no social approximation to it.

It would be possible to bring together at this point a tremendous number of individual victories by pacifist methods—not only victories in the sense of winning a question at issue but in the sense of converting a hostile opponent. Romantic fiction is filled with situations in which two galloping "he-men" meet in fistic conflict and after blows enough have been exchanged fall into each other's arms in a transport of mutual admiration. The history of duelling shows many such examples. But in these cases, nothing has been gained except sometimes a deeper reverence for the conflict method or else perhaps a common recognition of equality in folly. In the individual pacifist victories, on the other hand, there is something definitely gained of personal and social value, a step ahead in ethical perception.

There is a fairly abundant literature covering such uses of individual pacifism.[9] It is a more common thing than people generally suppose, and is practiced in family and other group relations by many who rave against pacifists.[10] The critical, thoughtful approach to these cases shown by some at least of the recorders will disarm the skeptic inclined to doubt their authenticity.

It is not essential to the present discussion to adduce such evidence here; but one example must be given in order to show the method and its working. There is an almost naïve simplicity in the following tale related by a friend to Henry C. Wright, but it is selected deliberately because it typifies the experience of so many in like situations:

> I once owned a large flock of hens; I generally kept them shut up. But, one spring, I concluded to let them run in my yard, after I had clipped their wings so they could not fly. One day, when I came home to dinner, I learned that one of my neighbors had been there, full of wrath, to let me know my hens had been

in his garden, and that he had killed several of them, and thrown them over into my yard. I was greatly enraged because he had killed my beautiful hens that I valued so much. I determined at once to be revenged, to sue him, or in some way get redress. I sat down and ate my dinner as calmly as I could. By the time I had finished my meal, I became more cool, and thought that perhaps it was best not to fight with my neighbor about hens, and thereby make him my bitter, lasting enemy. I concluded to try another way, being sure that it would be better.

After dinner I went to my neighbor's. He was in his garden. I went out and found him in pursuit of one of my hens with a club, trying to kill it. I accosted him. He turned upon me, his face inflamed with wrath, and broke out in a great fury—"You have abused me. I will kill all your hens, if I can get at them. I never was so abused. My garden is ruined." "I am very sorry for it," said I. "I did not wish to injure you, and now see that I have made a great mistake in letting out my hens. I ask your forgiveness and am willing to pay you six times the damage."

The man seemed confounded. He did not know what to make of it. He looked up at the sky—then down at the earth—and then at the poor hen he had been pursuing, and said nothing. "Tell me now," said I, "what is the damage, and I will pay you six-fold; and my hens shall trouble you no more. I will leave it entirely to you to say what I shall do. I cannot afford to lose the love and good-will of my neighbors and quarrel with them, for hens or anything else."

"I am a great fool!" said the neighbor. "The damage is not worth talking about; and I have more need to compensate you than you me, and to ask your forgiveness than you mine."

The manner in which the early moralists rose to their climaxes is often breath-taking. Yet none but the writers of stock jokes would find in such a story anything other than intelligence. It is the method which individuals use in the more civilized moments of their everyday lives, and which often works as well in situations of great danger. Many stories exist, for example, regarding the non-violent conversion of highwaymen.

Among the numerous cases of group pacifist victories, there is of course, none more striking than the famed "Holy Experiment" of William Penn. Of the Shakers in Indiana about 1812, surrounded by marauding tribes of aborigines, it is re-

lated how one of the chiefs, when asked point blank why his warriors never molested the members of this pacifist community, replied, "We warriors meddle with a peaceable people! That people, we know, will not fight. It would be a disgrace to hurt such a people." [11]

But a more amazing story, and yet bearing the earmarks of caution and written out of intimate contact with the scene and its characters, is Thomas Hancock's extraordinary narrative of Quakers in Ireland during the uprising of 1798. Here was a group of people in the thick of war, with religious views held by both contestants in sharp variance from their own "heresy," with their fields and houses overrun alternately by both sides, frequently threatened with execution for complicity. They met the crisis by a determined adherence to a program of love and service to all. They burned their hunting arms to make their pacifism consistent in the sight of the armed factions and to make it impossible for one of their own number to yield to the war method under any provocation. They bound up the wounds and satisfied the hunger of those who came to their thresholds for succor; they turned a stubborn but kindly face toward those who sought to exact by threat and torture information of military value; they refused all and sundry appeals for military assistance by whomsoever sought.

Again and again they were on the verge of extermination, but the blow did not fall. Ultimately, so widespread was the repute of their safety and the regard in which they were held by all the warring forces, that it became a custom for harassed village people to enter the homes of the Friends for self-protection, and when that was impossible to adopt a style of dress resembling theirs as closely as could be contrived.

These examples, however, do not satisfy the modern need. It is necessary for modern pacifism to have at least certain fairly definite hypotheses on which to base non-violent action. Three general types are required: non-violent resistance to a hostile aggressor; non-violent attack to hasten the transformation of evil and unjust social situations; and non-violent

mass action for the prevention of war. If indeed there is any evidence at all that non-violent methods exist which are capable of meeting such needs, if only in part, there is reason to hope for their development under practice into accepted resources of class and national groups.

It cannot be denied that many of the examples adduced by pacifist apologists have been unworthy of real attention, since they have not been the subject of careful checks and often contain intrinsic contradictions calculated to arouse suspicion. Such for example is the story of the Tyrolesian village wherein dwelt long ago a population of Christian pacifists. When attacked by the military forces of an enemy state determined on capturing the town, the village fathers made no preparations. Everyone remained at work; school children, brightly dressed, were paraded before the eyes of the would-be conquerors. "If there is nobody to fight with, we can't fight," stated the puzzled leader of the besieging army; whereupon he withdrew his forces and left the town as it was before he came. This yarn appears to have started with Mrs. Lydia Maria Child, and it is used to-day by pacifist groups to some extent, especially among children. It has grown with frequent repetition, but has never been proved as fact. The use of such material to establish a point is of course entirely indefensible. Nor is there any considerable value even in cases of genuine historicity, when these occurred under conditions greatly at variance with the current social scene.

However, there happen to be a number of instances, apparently well authenticated or on the face of them of unquestionable worth, which illustrate pacifist methods distinctly applicable in our modern social order.

Cases of Non-violent Resistance

What has been called "passive resistance" is no more passive in fact than "non-resistance" has been free from resistance. So varied are the non-violent methods of resistance—running all the way from sullen non-compliance at the lowest end of the scale to crusades of generous love at the highest, that for

all practical purposes the best general term is non-violent resistance.

An interesting example of non-violent resistance is that of the Scots-Irish Presbyterians during the Restoration. When the Puritan revolt occurred, a Scots army went to Ulster, which encouraged the growth of Presbyterianism to such a degree that by the time the Restoration took place in 1660 there were one hundred thousand Scots, with seventy ministers. The monarchy was determined on stamping out the Presbyterian faith. Against all coercion, legal and military, they opposed an unbending non-violent resistance. Neither the pleading of the King's agents nor the threat of massacre moved them from their resistance or provoked them to violence. The fact that they refused to join in the Catholic armed rebellion finally opened the minds of the ruling powers, and in a few years the persecutions to which they had ceaselessly been subjected were stopped. So changed was the situation by nine years from the beginning of their non-violent resistance that they were permitted freely to organize, and by 1672 the King even sent a gift to the Presbyterian ministers, who were in dire need after so long a struggle. Thus a victory was completely gained, within less than a decade, and without great loss of life, without a train of hatred, and yet without the sacrifice of honest principle.[12]

An illustration of victory by a national minority group suffering political persecution is afforded by the story of Francis Deak, a Catholic landowner of Hungary. When the Emperor Francis Joseph entered on a campaign during the middle of the last century to bend the neck of Hungary to his Austrian yoke, and after successive armed revolutions under Kossuth and others had failed to produce tangible results, Deak, who did not believe in the efficacy or ethics of violence (though he was not a pacifist of any school) succeeded in organizing a campaign of non-violent resistance which resulted first, in the acceptance of his leadership by the disillusioned Conservative Magyar war party, and ultimately in the capitulation of the Emperor. Satisfactory representation in the government was assured to

Hungary in 1867, and Deak, whose years of non-violent effort had been interrupted by several outbreaks of futile violence, became the hero of his people. Incorruptible, unselfish, capable, and a fighter of peace, he refused all the King's proffered honors "except the clasp of the hand." [13]

In the 'thirties of the nineteenth century the little Sandwich (Hawaiian) Islands were visited on several occasions by the naval vessels of foreign powers to enforce one demand or another. Usually these expeditions were successful in gaining treaties, commercial advantages, or religious missionary prerogatives. But one such raid seems to have signally failed. Here is Elihu Burritt's version of the incident:

> The weak little Government of the Sandwich Islands, in order to diminish the use and effect of intoxicating liquors among their people [always a devastating habit when brought into undeveloped countries], imposed a heavy tax upon French brandy and wine. This irritated the French, and they sent thither a great ship of war to compel the government to remove the tax; and the captain gave them but a few hours to comply with the demand. But they absolutely refused to obey. Then they must take the consequences, and these would be terrible. The lady of the French consul—good, kind, compassionate woman—went with her husband from house to house, and entreated the foreign residents to take refuge on board the French ship, for the island was to be blown up, or sunk, to punish the wicked government for taxing French brandy, and making drunkenness a dearer luxury to the people! But not a single person accepted of the refuge. The government held fast to its resolution without wavering for a moment. The French commander landed with his marines in battle array. Men with lighted matches stood at the great cannons of the ship. The hour of vengeance had come. Poor little people! what will become of you now? What will you do to defend yourselves against this resistless foe? Do? nothing but *endure*. "The King," says the report, "gave peremptory orders to his people to *oppose no resistance* to the Frenchmen. The gallant commander, therefore, landed his marines and took possession of the fort, custom-house, and some other Government buildings, *no resistance being offered*. All was still and peaceful in the streets, business going on as usual. Here they remained for some days; when, finding that the government would not accede at all to their demands, though they offered to leave the whole question to an

umpire, the chivalrous Frenchmen went to work to dismantle the fort, and destroyed everything within its walls. After having finished this Vandal-like work, they marched off with flying colors." How full of illustration is this case of passive resistance! The simple, quiet force of *endurance* which the government opposed to the French, wet their powder and turned their bayonets to straw. Against this unexpected force the marines were helpless. They had no arms to contend with such an enemy. All their weapons, and discipline, and bravery, were fitted only to overcome brute force; and of this they found none, except its shadow in the fort and its equipments; and with great valor they fell upon this shadow, and mutilated it terribly, and then marched back with flying colors! So far was this invasion of bayonet-power from inducing a settlement to the advantage of the French, that the government even refused their offer to submit the question to arbitration, or to put the law at any hazard of modification, in face of all the brute force that France could marshal against it.[14]

There is no question, however, that the possibility of British or American diplomatic intervention may have had something to do with France's failure to prosecute the issue with more ruthless treatment; for on the appeal of the Hawaiian government to the three nations jointly for an end to the too-frequent attentions of naval commanders, the islands' government was recognized by the United States in 1842 and two years later by the French and British. And yet the instance stands as apparently authentic and its lesson is obvious so far as it goes.

A case of non-violent resistance maintained by a population of several hundred thousand for a considerable period is to be found in the history of Hesse-Cassel. After being bandied about by the Napoleonic Wars this people finally came under the rule of an Elector allied to the Russian power. For many years the inhabitants struggled against a régime which bled them by unnecessary taxes and stood as a dissolute spectacle for Europe to see. When the revolutionary outbreaks of 1848 took place, there were many demonstrations of popular discontent, but these were almost entirely non-violent. Leaders kept close watch on the people for any outbursts of violence, and even persuaded thousands to sign a pledge against the use of intoxi-

cants while the pacific revolt was on, lest the benefit of cool heads and calm behavior under provocation be undone by some ill-considered indiscretion.[15] A partially democratic constitution was won, and though it was revoked within two years, the revolt persisted and the Elector Friedrich Wilhelm fled in secret. Nevertheless, the non-violent character of the "revolution" must be qualified by the fact that Friedrich Wilhelm dared not trust his own troops and feared a violent outbreak from that source against his rule on behalf of the oppressed peasants and laborers.

Just as the pacifist Cathari of the Middle Ages developed from the military Paulicians, so in Persia the non-violent religion of Bahaism sprang up from the sometimes-insurrectionist Babiism founded in 1845 by the youthful Mirza Ali Muhammed. From the moment when the saintly Baha u'llah (whose name means Splendor of God) definitely gained the ascendancy over rival factions in 1863, this great movement took on a highly interesting pacifist character. The history of the Bahais has been one of almost continuous persecution until recent times. They were deported from Persia to Constantinople in 1863, and from there to Adrianople. While their religion has Mohammedan roots, it holds that new tenets must be derived from contemporary ideas, and it has developed into a religion of a highly intelligent and progressive nature.

The Bahais, like the Armenians, were persecuted by the Turks, but unlike them did not resort to arms. They resisted, but their resistance was moral. Their history is too long and significant to be related here, even in brief. Suffice it to say that whereas the Armenians evoked only fresh hostility by their military resistance, the Bahais gradually achieved increasing toleration and their losses, though heavy and bitter, were markedly less. Baha u'llah, though jailed for many years, saw his movement grow under persecution, and it has been no different with his son Abdul Baha. To-day Bahaism has spread throughout the world, with thousands of followers in the United States.

The Versailles Conference, as the Congress of Vienna had

done before it, awoke the determination of oppressed peoples to get their cases before the negotiators and thus in the light of world regard. Two outstanding efforts, made by whole peoples when their delegates were refused a hearing or denied in their appeals, were those of Egypt and Korea.

Egypt resorted to a boycott of no small dimensions. Although some of her student hotheads had tried the old discredited tactics of assassination, the Nationalist spokesmen urged a systematic boycott accompanied by no violence whatsoever. At the game of violence the British oppressors had them entirely outclassed. With a boycott it was very different. Lord Milner was sent with a commission to hear what was on the Egyptians' minds. The latter, reasonably enough, felt that Britain knew very well. They refused to go near the commissioners; their workers struck; students left their classes and picketed Milner's band; even the public officials in all departments of the government went on a strike of three weeks' duration.[16] "In this affair," says Professor Case, after reading an account of the demonstration by A. Fenner Brockway, "we see again the enormous social pressure that can be exerted by even the lowliest and weakest when by some form of concerted non-violent action they shut off the supply of social contacts without which the mightiest tyranny must languish and die." [17]

The Korean people, whose history is probably much more pacifistic than that of the Chinese, had been undergoing patiently the imposition of heavier and heavier burdens at the hands of Japan, their ruler since 1904. Now they must be heard from. Through the most painstaking care they were organized into a discipline of protest the equal of which has in all probability never been seen elsewhere. They drew up a Declaration of Independence signed by thirty-three men prepared for death, made arrangements for its distribution to the entire populace, read it in a meeting, and then notified the police of what was going on. They were of course immediately jailed. But the revolt went on, and went on everywhere, under the noses of the bewildered Japanese. Even boys braved the ire of school officials and right in the latter's faces waved the pro-

scribed Korean flag, crying aloud "Mansei," "Long Live Korea." The remarkable demonstration failed to achieve its purpose, principally through inability to secure adequate co-operation from all commercial classes in an economic boycott. But it showed the world that a people can organize the boldest kind of resistance in the face of terrorism and yet remain non-violent.[18]

It is well known that Irish resistance to conscription in the World War caused the British government to give up the plan as far as Erin was concerned. The Irish were in doubt as to what method of resistance would be most effective, and it is worthy of thought that they sent envoys to discuss the matter with the leaders of the English conscientious objectors' movement—the No-Conscription Fellowship. Returning, they advocated non-violent resistance and non-violent resistance won.[19]

When the French army invaded the Ruhr in 1923, non-violent resistance was adopted by some of the workers' organizations and spread like wildfire among the people. In this case it was less a product of previous conviction than of expediency, which is one of the reasons why eventually it failed to accomplish its purpose of forcing a withdrawal by the French. There were other reasons, according to a pacifist eye-witness:

> The simple truth is that passive resistance in the Ruhr did not achieve its ultimate aim because, and *solely* because, the Berlin Government betrayed the cause of the German people by its mismanagement of the battle, the corruption which marked the financial side of the struggle, and the complete and absolute miscalculations on the part of the Cuno Government as to the duration of the contest and how it should be carried on.[20]

And even thus, the fact remains that the French soon began to realize they had hold of a hot poker. Their invasion was costing them far more than it was worth. There is no doubt that the unhappy outcome of this expedition and the cruelties inflicted on the non-violent German population had a bad taste in their mouths, and that the establishment of the Dawes Plan was welcomed not merely as the assurance of reparations—they knew they could never collect the sums that this arrange-

ment provided—but as an excuse to pull back the troops from a rather sorry adventure.

These instances, when examined with all wise qualifications, certainly do something to dispel the notion that "pacifism has never been tried." But in concrete ways other than non-violent resistance pacifism has demonstrated value.

Examples of the Strike for Peace

Among war resisters' groups a number of cases in which war has been prevented by anti-war demonstrations have been repeated, and repeated sometimes, I fear, with inadequate investigation of the circumstances. One of these is the prevention of war between Norway and Sweden in 1905. The question involved was dissolution of the union between these two peoples. For over ten years Norway's demands for separate consuls and foreign ministers had been growing more insistent. In the Swedish election of 1900 the public showed a plain preference for conciliatory tactics, even in respect to the proposal for an entirely separate Norwegian flag. But as successive efforts at diplomacy availed little and as Storthing after Storthing convened without yielding to Norway's requests or satisfying, either, the inflammatory nationalism of Swedish jingos, tension increased to the point where the efforts of men like Nansen and Branting seemed insufficient to prevent hostilities. At this point the socialists of both countries held demonstrations and launched their slogan of "No War Service."

In the adoption of peace policies, eventuating in the definite separation of the two countries, this drastic action undoubtedly had considerable part. The question is only how acute was the war danger in fact, and there is some reason to believe that the leadership on both sides was none too eager to precipitate a conflict. The credit to the socialist war resistance need not be taken away, however, for it exerted a marked influence on public opinion generally and was assuredly a factor in turning the tide.

Another instance is frequently reported in war-resistance literature as follows: "In 1909, owing to the protest of the

Spanish people against their Government's imperialist war in Morocco, the Spanish troops were withdrawn." Such an unqualified statement of an interesting incident is not a little misleading. The resentment of the Spanish public against the dictatorial and underhanded measures of the Maura Ministry was due at first as much to internal matters as to foreign. When Spanish railroad workers were attacked and routed by Riff tribesmen in the Moroccan regions being exploited by *concessionaires,* the government desired to placate the interests involved but knew it could exact no direct military appropriations for new armies from the Cortes. It therefore juggled funds among its departments and announced partial conscription by calling out the Catalan reserves. The answer of the Spanish workers, under anarchist and socialist leadership, was the proclamation of a general strike in Barcelona. It must be noted that whereas some elements in the protesting forces were motivated by a pacifist opposition to war, the general public would certainly have backed the Moroccan adventure had the previous experience been successful. It had not; the hardships of such foreign campaigns had brought little prestige to Spanish nationalism and only, among the people, a conviction of their uselessness. Though the strike, as all "general" strikes must ever be, was only partial, it led to actual revolutionary outbreaks with violent rioting: though as usual the violence was mainly on the side of the authorities. A veritable reign of terror followed; the great philosophical anarchist, Francisco Ferrer, was seized and shot, chiefly to show a governmental power that did not exist; and finally the Maura government was forced to resign. Again, the potency of a strike for peace had been tested and not found wanting—but only in part, for those whose nonviolence was conscious or sincere were in all probability too small a portion of those protesting.

In 1918, immediately following the Armistice, the old sea dogs of the German High Seas Fleet, unmindful of a little thing like a truce, determined to make a last desperate gesture. Herr Ditmann, a socialist member of the Reichstag, exposed this effort to its Committee of Inquiry, and also revealed how

the sailors of the Fleet simply refused to take out the ships. This incident has been made wide use of in European pacifist circles, and is suggestive; but it is highly questionable whether the strike was inspired by noble adherence to an armistice or by hatred of war so much as by a recognition of the folly involved in such a stunt and an appreciation of the fact that the German cause was irrevocably lost. Among the socialist leadership, obviously, were those who had been infused by the growing determination to get rid of the monarchy and its war policies. Even for socialists however, it required a catastrophe to the German arms to win many of them away from the nationalist war program.

The War of the Allied tools against Russia in 1919 and 1920 brought to light two minor incidents which have some bearing on the strike for peace, though undue significance should not be attached to them. Five cruisers were dispatched to the Baltic by France, as part of her anti-Soviet campaign. Filled with a feeling—general more or less throughout the world in labor ranks, except in the United States where the war policy of labor had totally anæsthetized its leadership—that these attacks on Russia were unjustified and tended to prolong a warfare everyone but government officials was sick of, the sailors on these ships struck against war. They were brought home in disgrace but they had spiked the guns of the French navy so far as that crusade was concerned.

Poland's war, engineered chiefly by French instigation, required the transport of munitions through Upper Silesia, a region bristling with discontent at the Versailles Treaty and rebellion over the intrigue behind the war. Here the trade unions struck against the carriage of arms, and their refusal of work was decisive—the materials of war did not go through.

Of immeasurably greater import was the prevention of a British war against Russia in 1920. The Cabinet fire-eaters were determined on joining openly in the warfare which they had been carrying on covertly by the aid of the subsidized White armies in new Russia. There was a conscription bill up in Parliament at the time, and this added fuel to the mounting

flames of Labor revolt. The Triple Alliance, made up of the Railwaymen, the Miners, and the Transport workers, served notice on the government that it demanded the recall of the conscription project, the withdrawal of all British troops in Russia, the release of all conscientious objectors still imprisoned, and the raising of the infamous blockade, which had brought useless and untold agony to a war-destitute people. A joint conference of the Labor Party, the Parliamentary Labor Party, and the Trades Union Congress explicitly warned the authorities that "the whole industrial power of the organized workers will be used to defeat this war." The war was defeated; the prestige of the Labor groups was enhanced rather than diminished; and along with it the prestige of pacific policies.

In a more localized but very significant area the strike for peace was once more clearly triumphant. German militarism, monarchism, nationalism and reaction died hard. In 1920 Dr. Kapp, the instrument of backward-looking forces bent on gaining control of the situation, organized a *putsch,* a secret drive to take control of Berlin and thence to capture power throughout the nation. His effort failed, and as a commentator has said "the fact that it failed was momentous." Why it failed and the conditions of its collapse are told vividly by Wilfred Wellock, a Labor member of Parliament:

> I was staying in Berlin and I was living in the centre of the city. On a particular Friday night, quite unknown to anybody, a few thousand troops marched into Berlin and took possession of the city. During Saturday and Sunday a general strike was organized by the workers of Berlin, and it was the most complete general strike that has ever taken place in any part of the world. By Sunday evening that strike was in perfect order, and on Monday morning there was not a single service running, gas and electricity were cut off, water was allowed to run, but it was impossible to have any cooked food, and so on, for a period of four or five days, and the result was that the Government, who were previously opposed to a general strike—as much opposed to it as are the present Government of this country—were glad to welcome the general strike as the only means of saving the situation. It did save the situation, and without a safety valve of that

kind any country is liable to be in a very queer street when certain situations arise.

That is a very germane illustration of what may happen, and the result was that by the following Thursday evening the whole action of the Kapp *putsch* fell to pieces, and terms were made. I stood on that Thursday evening in the Leipzigerstrasse at the foot of Wilhelmstrasse, and I watched a few thousand troops, according to the terms of the agreement, march out of the city, defeated by a defenceless mass of people who had operated a very successful general strike.

Mr. Wellock, who was speaking in the House of Commons, went on to raise a pertinent query:

> I suggest that on any matter where war is involved, there is likely to be a large amount of opposition in this country, and a general strike for, say, twenty-four hours, in which people might be able to express their attitude upon a matter of such great importance, is a matter that ought to be very seriously considered. How else can a people manifest its will in a very critical situation such as the proclaiming of a war except by some such method as a general stoppage for twenty-four hours?[21]

It must be pointed out in accuracy that the bulk of these "strikes for peace" occurred not in normal times of war preparation, not in the sort of situation out of which future wars are most likely to grow. They took place when entire populations were still feeling the clutch of war horror and paying sacrificially the price of its financial waste.

And yet, as the will to peace grows stronger and more widespread, it will seek out new means of effective expression. Whatever their defects, there is incomparably less danger than in the risk of unprevented war, and it may well be that here is a weapon which leaves no scars and kills nothing but the lust of killers.

Hateless, Non-violent Attack

Men will never be content to entrust their liberties to resistance, no matter how non-violent or effective. It will be necessary, if the peace is to be kept, to provide a mode of pacifist revolt, some way by which initiatory action may be

taken in the cause of justice. It is here that non-violent attack offers an opportunity too little grasped as yet.

Non-violent attack has been tried, and has been proved successful, in certain cases. It must be admitted that the border line is vague, sometimes, between what I have called "resistance" and "attack." A desire for social change inevitably is rooted in dissatisfaction with a present policy or condition. And yet a difference there is, a difference more demonstrable by concrete incident than by abstract reasoning.

In his *Outline of History* H. G. Wells describes the revolt of the plebs of Ancient Rome in 494 B.C. as a "general strike." It was non-violent, the plebeians demanding reforms which they had been promised, and when these were refused, twice marching up the Tiber to found, as they threatened, a new city. Professor Case comments on this revolt by saying that "this was the work of the original *proletariat,* and it was done without disorder." There is indeed in this non-violent insistence some small significance for pacifism, perhaps, but after all not much. The plebs who led this strike were in many cases landowners, and the energy of the affair centered in returned soldiers who rebelled at being ordered to new wars before realizing some of the visions long dangled before their eyes by the wily patricians, who now capitulated less because of the strike's effect than from fear the ex-warriors might start a hostile march on the capital and bring about a violent overturn.

The early Quaker conflict with the New England Puritans came about because the Friends were determined to wage a crusade against the intrenched theocracy. "Let all nations hear the sound by word or writing," George Fox had admonished; "be valiant for the truth upon earth; and tread and trample upon all that is contrary." [22] The fight they carried on for freedom would never have resulted in the ultimate victory that it did, had not these Quakers been unwilling to wait for injustice to knock on their own front doors. How relevant their experience is to the question of non-violent attack may be gathered from the words of a sympathetic narrator:

Governor Endicott and the chief priests of New England imagined a vain thing; death and burial were the only possible means of getting their disturbers underground, and for every one so disposed of a dozen more appeared to torment the killers. Most alarming of all, a steadily increasing number of the simple, those "least affected to the order of government in church and commonwealth" murmured at the atrocities committed in the name of law and order. No wonder Endicott complained to England that they were not persecuting the Quakers, that the Quakers were persecuting them.[23]

An illuminating contrast is discoverable between the insistence of the Cape Colony in 1848 that Britain abandon a proposed shipment of criminals, and its insistence on dominance over the native tribes. The first of these movements was nonviolent; the second was military. The former succeeded beyond all expectation; the latter involved the colonists in a bitter war. This agitation of 1848 began when the British government inquired of its colonies what their views would be regarding the reception of convicts and criminals who had fallen foul of the law during the desperate days of the famine in Ireland. Incidentally, many of these so-called criminals were in reality "politicals" "framed" under the usual method of imperialist oppression. The people at the Cape of Good Hope were outraged by the proposal, and still more when they learned that without waiting for their reply the government had dispatched *H.M.S. Neptune* bearing two hundred and eighty-nine convicts (among them the Irish insurrectionist, John Mitchell).

In high anger settlers of the Cape Colony discussed the problem and the means of enforcing their will. By a flash of insight they resolved to depend not on violence but on agitation and non-intercourse. Thus when the Governor, Sir Harry Smith, saw what he was up against he gave in and ordered the men to be kept in the harbor pending a disposition of the case. And what he was up against was simply this: a tightly organized Anti-Convict Association, pledged to have no business or social dealings with anyone whatsoever who was involved in any way with "landing, supplying, or employing convicts." There was nothing to be done except communicate with the

home authorities and recommend a change. The boat was sent, after five months, to Tasmania. Noteworthy indeed is the moral indignation and sanctification of the colonists, who never once, apparently, were moved to compassion by the thought of nearly three hundred poor wretches herded on that dismal ship, doubtless in close confinement under vile conditions (there was little else in prison treatment at that time) for all those weary months of voyaging and anchoring.

The non-violent victory encouraged the Colony to new demands, this time for a constitution and political autonomy, and having learned a lesson, the British government made haste to grant them a constitution of a most liberal character. But after all these demonstrations of non-violent success when dealing with their equals, the Colony proceeded in the most high-handed military fashion to deal with its "inferiors," the native tribes, and succeeded only in precipitating the desperate Gaika tribal war, followed by a three years' war with all the Kaffir tribes.

A border-line case between non-violent resistance and attack is the Chinese boycott of Japanese goods in an effort to obtain the restoration of Shantung. This large territory, wrested from German control by the World War, was voted to Japan by the Versailles Conference in 1919. Hardly had word been borne to China when the student movement roused itself to vigorous protest. The protest developed into a vast program of Chinese national regeneration. At first there were a few exhibitions of violence, but these were less if anything than those occurring in normal times. The student youth massed themselves into efficiently disciplined units, went about speaking and awakening the merchants, and penetrated the entire population "from Kwantung to the Mongol border, and from the Yellow Sea to Kuenlun Mountain." [24] Under the impact of this movement the Japanese shops, one by one, were compelled to close. Finally the wisdom, even the absolute necessity, of giving up or facing commercial ruin forced the Japanese government to yield. Some fifty million dollars loss had been sustained; the appeals of merchants for armed intervention only

brought from the Japanese officials the intelligent and realistic reply that it "knew of no way by which the Chinese merchants, much less the Chinese people, could be made to buy Japanese goods against their will." [25]

Unquestionably the greatest demonstrations of non-violent attack the world has ever seen have been taking place in India since 1920 under the inspiration, chiefly, of Mohandas Karamchand (Mahatma) Gandhi. This great-souled leader had prepared himself for a career as a lawyer. It was while on a legal mission to South Africa that he was stirred to his depths by the oppression of Indian workers there, who, he declared, were treated like beasts. He himself was subjected to much the same sort of experience an American Negro would meet if he forgot the color line and Jim Crow cars in Mississippi. Gandhi studied the conditions of the Indians, and the last straw which moved him to enter the struggle on their behalf was the proposal to disfranchise the Indians of Natal in 1893. He failed in this particular, but he had awakened in the hearts of his fellow countrymen a sense of solidarity. When further repressive laws were passed in 1906 Gandhi organized a great movement of non-violent resistance in which some three thousand Indians took a solemn oath not to obey the laws, come what might. Civil disobedience, refusal to pay unjust taxes, strikes and great mass demonstrations, all coupled with patient endurance of suffering and punishment, brought in eight years a reversal of policy and the vindication of Gandhi's method of "soul force," "truth force," or "love force," as he has variously called it.

To press the demands of India for autonomy against the British rule was the next spectacular campaign launched in 1920 by Gandhi. Again despite his strong insistence on definite steps toward freedom, the program was one of non-violent non-coöperation, the spirit of *ahimsa,* non-killing, "deliberate self-suffering, not a deliberate injuring of the supposed wrongdoer."

That first non-violent crusade was halted by the arrest of Gandhi, but back of this was a series of other factors: inadequate organization, insufficient time to educate the people in

his methods, a lack of solidarity within India itself, and poor discipline and self-control among the masses, whose outbreaks of violence saddened their leader and made him realize that more time was required before a victorious campaign could begin.

In 1928 one of the most revealing demonstrations of non-violent resistance-attack ever made was conducted in Bardoli, in Bombay Province, India, along the lines of Gandhi's tactics though not intimately directed by him. Revolting against an outrageous increase of taxes on their lands, and determined to slacken in general the bonds that were pressing upon them with unbearable pressure, some three hundred thousand peasants, under able leadership, waged a sensational pacific struggle and won. The full details of this incident are described in a book of 363 pages, *The Story of Bardoli,* written by Mahadev Desai and published in 1929 by the Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad, well illustrating the type of pacifist literature which, whatever its weaknesses, is steadily becoming more concrete.

And as this volume goes to press, the great movement for independence launched by Gandhi's historic march to the sea for the breaking of the salt laws—first stage in a deliberate campaign of civil disobedience—has brought a deadlock in the ancient forces of empire and freedom. This time, though there have been minor outbursts of violence by Indian nationalists and the movement is by no means completely in accord with the non-violence of Gandhi, Sarojini Naidu, the Nehrus and other leaders, nevertheless the most outstanding thing about the struggle is the amazingly slight resort to violence by the Indians in the face of brutal force by British troops and the native constabulary. It is impossible to predict the outcome, either in terms of the conflict's aims or methods. Everything depends upon the ability of the nationalists to preserve their unity, their courage, and especially their disciplined reliance on non-violence. It is safe to say that if they hold firmly to their purpose and their method without compromise of one or the other, the British *raj* is doomed. Nothing which has yet happened has dimmed the luster of Mahatma Gandhi's consecration, and

until the censorship was clapped on, there were numerous evidences in the clashes between rulers and rebels attesting the strategic invulnerability of this stoutly assertive non-military struggle.[26]

The power wielded over the masses by this slight-framed man is extraordinary. It is not due to a cultish or fanatical element in his make-up, for Gandhi is anything but the typical Oriental prophet—he is a modern, an editor, a lawyer, a person of practical political affairs as well as a saint of mysticism. The source of his power lies largely in the weapons he has used. When violence broke out in 1924 among his followers he published a letter announcing a fast of penance, in which he said, to the "Men and Women of Bombay,"

> It is not possible to describe to you the agony I have suffered during the past two days. I am writing this now at 3.30 A.M. in perfect peace. After two hours' prayer and meditation, I have found it.
>
> I must refuse to eat or drink anything but water till the Hindus and Mussulmans of Bombay have made peace with the Parsis, the Christians, and the Jews, and till the non-coöperators have made peace with the coöperators. . . . There is only one God for us all whether we find him through the Koran, the Bible, the Zend-Avesta, the Talmud, or the Gita. And he is God of Truth and Love. I have no interest in living save for proving this faith in me. I cannot hate an Englishman or anyone else.

And this despite arrogance, bombs, even massacres, directed at his people. His great fast of twenty-one days to restore Hindu-Moslem unity was broken, while four thousand loving followers stood outside the little bungalow near Delhi, after the singing of a favorite hymn in the Gujarati tongue, which runs, "The way to God is only meant for heroes; it is not meant for shrinkers. There must be self-abandonment to the full. Only those who are ready to give up all for His sake, can attain. As the diver dives down into the sea for pearls, even so heroic souls dive deep in their search for God."[27]

The manner in which the spirit of non-violent insistence was communicated to the warlike Akali Sikhs and led them to a demonstration of its power has stirred numerous observers.[28]

The Akali Sikhs have had a history filled with violence, and the protagonists of their great non-violent struggle of 1923 and 1924 were partly soldiers returned from the World War trenches. They sought to carry on afresh an old attempt to purge their temples of a corrupt priesthood and to secure a cessation of British persecutions and restrictions. Dramatic in the extreme is the story of their gatherings, defiant in the face of repeated brutality and slaughter; their delegations sent day after day to intercede with the authorities, knowing imprisonment awaited them each time; their sufferance of beatings, sending a hundred new victims for every ten that were beaten. One-third of those who suffered death or wounds in the hideous Amritsar massacre were Sikhs, though not all Akalis. That the patient, but persistent demand for justice made non-violently by this people exerted a great psychological effect on Indian morale can hardly be doubted. It still must be judged, as to its final success, along with the great movement of which it is a part.

Whether the method of Gandhi proves practically victorious or not, at the very least it is a magnificent experiment in the sort of tactics with which the world is hardly through.

Mahatma Gandhi, indubitably, has more than a few defects of political and social judgment; he is not a superman. And yet as his friend, C. F. Andrews, has said:

> His name will be remembered and sung long after the names of the modern governors in their palaces at New Delhi are forgotten. When all the buildings . . . have crumbled into ruins, the name of Mahatma Gandhi will still be taught by mothers to their little children as one of the greatest of India's saints and saviors.

Whither Non-Violence?

No living person can guess how fast or how widely non-violent resistance and attack will actually supplant the already superannuated method of war. In view of the colossal evils man has outgrown, no extravagant faith in human nature is required to sustain a belief that war will go. But will it pass in time, before it has left the human race a depleted, ener-

vated species, hardly able to cope with the stern fees which Nature exacts in return for assurance of survival?

At any rate, here at hand are substitutes for war and for the old peace methods which have not been adequate. Here are the newer peace dynamics.

In one area, at least, there is reason to believe non-violent insistence will increasingly, and speedily, commend itself as the best means to rely on. Previously in this book I have remarked that never again can there be an American Revolution, model of 1776. It is beyond dispute, I think, that the vastly augmented advantages which the new military devices have placed in the hands of authority and the ruling groups, render violent tactics of revolt in most places of the world impracticable and in many places palpably absurd. It will be proved less and less sound to proclaim such a slogan as the Russian revolutionists of 1905 declared at the head of a public statement announcing the execution of the Grand Duke Sergius: "By combat your rights can be conquered."

For all minorities the non-violent method is already superior, I am persuaded, and will ere long be perceived superior, at least in well-developed societies, even by those who have not in our day renounced all bellicose procedure. With the increasing organization of community life into voluntary associations, a non-violent crisis-solidarity will become more and more feasible. Even revolution by violence, that Grand Passion of orthodox Marxian communism so assiduously cultivated by the devotees of doctrinaire proletarian economics, may gradually reveal itself, except for agrarian, remote and uncultured regions a delusion if not a deadly snare. The overthrow of oppression is a problem of sociology, psychology, and economics, and is only incidentally a problem of physical power.[29]

No new application of a great principle, even though the principle be as old as glacial rock, can come into instantaneous and universal use. "A drop of water," says Emerson, "has the properties of the sea, but it cannot exhibit a storm." Nevertheless, drops of water are not like human customs and inventions. "Humanity moves on by the accumulation of small im-

pulses and causes, the step-by-step elimination of hindrances, not by explosions. It would seem, however, that once the conditions have been met, and a certain surplus of attention and energy is released, there is something cumulative in the process, akin to the acceleration noted in the physical law of falling bodies." [30]

Only when the stage is ready can the new program for winning justice attract men generally to its standard. I do not think that time has come. And yet on the horizon are more than faint portents that it is arriving, and that not forever will be delayed the happy dawn when the fight for justice and the fight for peace shall be as one.

CHAPTER XXV

ALMOST THOU PERSUADEST ME

Come, friends! Let us make a stand! Can we not resist this contagion, whatever its nature and virulence be—whether moral epidemic or cosmic force?—ROMAIN ROLLAND, *Above the Battle.* (Open Court Publishing Co., 1916.)

CHAPTER XXV

ALMOST THOU PERSUADEST ME

When Napoleon's armies swept across Europe like a merciless cyclone, the little Corsican encountered a group of Moravians who besought his tolerance of their pacifist faith and his protection from the insults of his troops. Bonaparte treated them with kindness, remarking that he could understand their viewpoint since he himself was preëminently a friend of peace!

There have been millions of Napoleonic pacifists, and they are still at large among us. On the other hand, there are many people genuinely sympathetic with the spirit of war resistance but who are unable to accept it for themselves because of honest doubts. They are for peace; but cannot completely trust the peace process. Their questions are not trivial or superficial. These are, however, perplexities which pacifists have not evaded, and through which they have had to find their way.

The ultimate peace resistance of thoughtful people probably boils down to certain definite faults they see in the pacifist position. It is extremely doubtful whether the answer to these criticisms, in so far as they exist, will be found through debate; they must be discovered in one's own thought and observation. People whose support would count can never be bombarded into pacifism by what Swift called "the artillery of words." It will not do harm, however, and may possibly be worth while, to face these alleged pacifist disabilities and suggest the lines of reasoning that many pacifists have followed in their personal experience.

I. *It is irrational, doctrinaire, and unscientific to decide about a future conflict now; to declare for non-participation in war before the issues of the war and the facts regarding it are known.*

One of the most apparent weaknesses of this argument is its failure to face the fact, proved through the history of wars by the hundreds if not all wars, that there is little or no relation between the announced purpose of any war and the outcome of it. Innumerable crusades for the crushing of evil have only built up the same or worse evils among the crusaders. *War is absolutely uncontrollable.* Wars start out to accomplish one object and soon come to be carried on for entirely another. The personnel of warring governments often undergoes rapid change, more often toward reaction than toward moderation. Supporters of so-called noble war cannot withdraw when they consider the war has become transformed in character; rarely will they have the moral and intellectual ability to detect the wrongs of a war machine which they have given their aid to build.

When recently asked, "What would you do in case of the outbreak of a new war?" Professor Albert Einstein, famous for his theories of relativity, replied not quite so relatively:

> I should unconditionally refuse every direct or indirect war service and try to induce my friends to take the same attitude, and that regardless of the general opinion of the causes of the war.[1]

It will be moderately difficult for the most vehement foe of pacifism to dismiss this as the outpouring of an unscientific and untrained mind.

To many people such a declaration constitutes a "pledge" and all pledges are eschewed. It has come within my observation that not a few who have no use for "pledges" have worked earnestly to support and advertise the pledge of war renunciation given explicitly, if only partially, in the Pact of Paris. Mr. Borah, a prime mover in the proceedings by which the Briand-Kellogg treaty came into force, has definitely called it a "pledge." Why may not citizens, as well as governments, make treaties renouncing war? The war resisters of the world have made treaties with each other outlawing war from this time on.

Declarations are not always the means of opening hostilities.

In the period from 1700 to 1870, according to a French historian, one hundred and seven wars were begun without a formal declaration. Fighting preceded a declaration in the war between Spain and China in 1894. President McKinley did not ask Congress for a declaration of war against Spain until three days after we had begun to fight, and Congress finally made the declaration retroactive to cover the situation. Warfare by Japan on Russia commenced in 1904 three days before a declaration. Attacks against weak colonial peoples have rarely if ever been dignified by any formality. The political systems of Germany and England were such that in the World War neither had to go through any cumbersome process akin to a genuine declaration. "Quite probably," says one writer, "the next war will begin unceremoniously with a sudden rush of invading airplanes."[2]

Contrast the dallying liberal pacifist who will not commit himself openly to an anti-war position, with the war forces which in advance have determined what they shall do if war should threaten. The latter are ready. They know what to do. Their minds on this point are crystal clear. The peace forces in comparison are unprepared, confused, with no plan or program, waiting, darkly, for light by which to see their duty. On such an issue, which is surer to win?

There is nothing in all the human universe more doctrinaire than war. Once in the war system, part and parcel of it, only the fullest conformity is tolerated. In a non-conformist war resister, opposition is sedition; in a soldier it is treason. The soldier, as his name betrays, is a "sold" man; his body and his mind are no property of his, for they belong to his superior officer. His uniform, his "death's livery" in the words of Colonel T. E. Lawrence is a sign that its wearers have "sold their wills and bodies to the State"; the fighting man who puts it on has "assigned his owner the twenty-four hours' use of his body; and sole conduct of his mind and passions."[3]

For the private soldier the one thing needful is obedience. Imagination, thought, fear, love, and even hate are out of place, and through stern discipline these can be excluded. . . . Personal

conscience is one of the hardest things to modify or eliminate in any training. And yet it may be one of the most dangerous things that can be left. For it may easily turn a man from obedience to his superior officer at a critical moment. It may suggest pity for a wounded enemy or a would-be-enemy prisoner with whom the army dare not encumber itself. It may cause the hand to waver at the moment it should strike without hesitation. In short, it may whisper in the soldier's ear the dreadful admonition, "Thou shalt not kill." It may give him sleepless nights and unfit him for duty when, if he had the simple army conscience, which is founded on implicit obedience, he might leave all responsibility on the shoulders of his superior officers and sleep like a child and awake refreshed—to kill and fear not.[4]

Which is nearer the truth? The person who thinks pacifism is too dogmatic, and expects to be able to use his reason within ongoing, everchanging, uncontrollable war; or, let us say, an extremist like Shelley, who said of war in his famous *Declaration of Rights,* "Man has no right to kill his brother; it is no excuse that he does so in uniform. He only adds the infamy of servitude to the crime of murder."

It was a soldier, Henri Barbusse, who told the unqualified truth about the use of scientific judgment regarding war by those who are once led to give it their backing: "The soldier is never warned what is to be done with him; they put a bandage on his eyes and they only remove it at the last minute." [5]

It is an inescapable paradox that the only time when any facts bearing on the causes and aims of a war are useful is just before the war begins. And it is precisely at this time when facts do not exist for the man outside the counsels of the war makers; often these do not know much of actual fact themselves. Facts have little to do with war; the real facts behind a war at one time may be identical with those which do not bring war at another. And there is no lesson that war teaches more clearly to those who have lived through its blind futility than the utter unwillingness of governments, when in a crisis or when war is imminent, to allow any free inquiry into facts. At such a time, as I have elsewhere said, every cable becomes a carrier of falsehood, every telegraph wire a channel of pollution, every wind

of gossip a pestilence of perversion.[6] Studying war in a long look backward, one finds that the significant thing is not the purpose of war but the astonishing uniformity of its social consequences. The last place in the world to look for an opportunity to be rational is in war, the sum of all irrationality.

II. *Successful pacifism would render impossible the protection of weak and oppressed nations, and would ensure the dominance of the strong and ruthless.*

To people of sensitive conscience and social spirit no appeal is likely to be stronger than the call of those who writhe under the heel of an oppressor. It seems cowardly, selfish, to withhold aid, "to cling to a precious little principle and let the other fellow suffer."

"Oh, what a lovely outside falsehood hath!" Against this highly commendable moral position, however, certain facts stand opposed. One fact is that the number of cases of totally unprovoked attacks against a *peaceable, non-military* people are extremely few. A people which has tried the war weapon and found it unavailing has already placed itself in a situation where it has small claim on our sympathies compared to the claim of the world's millions who must suffer by war unless a new way is shown by practical example.

How much stronger would have been the opportunity for Americans protesting against the invasion of Nicaragua in 1927 had Sandino and his patriotic bands adopted a campaign of non-violent non-coöperation instead of the fruitless guerrilla warfare!

The case of Belgium for support when invaded by the Germans in 1914 would have been stronger had it not been for her new conscription law, the recent reorganization of her army, and her bristling forts massed along the narrow German border. There is a pathetic grimness about the description of pre-war Belgium in the friendly *Encyclopedia Britannica* (12th edition). After outlining the steadily increasing measures of preparedness, the article says: " . . . a completely organized mobilization was prepared; confidence was at last felt in both officers and troops." And what a slender reed war really is!

A. Maude Royden, England's famous woman preacher, has spoken interestingly on this issue. She says, in *The Great Adventure,*

We were bound to defend Belgium by every means in our power. And I think we were bound, as Christians, to defend her, and to defend France also, when they were threatened, even had we not been further bound by treaties or understandings. To defend the weak is always our duty when defence is any way possible. And I for one agree that to have remained neutral last August would have been worse than to go to war. To stand out, to seek our own safety, to remain spectators only of the agony of Belgium, would have been the basest of all betrayals.

War was better than neutrality, if these were the only alternatives. . . . Christ was not neutral between God and man, but neither did He make war. He chose another alternative—He made peace.

What then could we have done? How could we have "made peace"? What we did do will be easily remembered. We invited Germany to a conference in London, pointing out to her that we could not stand by and see treaty obligations trampled on, and little nations oppressed. How must that have sounded in German ears? "You," they might have retorted, "have defied all your treaty obligations in Egypt, and you are defying them now. You have practically given up even the pretence that you are going to observe them. . . ."

The fact, therefore, that we were not trusted was crucial. It was useless to argue and to protest. The facts were against us. Had we—not by words that would have been disbelieved, or protests on which our own record cast a doubt, but by acts—proved that we, at least, intended no attack, I do not believe the German Foreign Office could have refused to confer with us. I do not believe that the Socialists would have supported the war votes in the Reichstag, or that the Socialist soldiers (estimated to be two-fifths of the German army) would have marched. . . .

If we had disarmed in the first week of last August—not by an arbitrary decision of the Foreign Office, but on a demand from the people—there would have been no war. The world would have been changed. No nation would have rushed into war in "self-defence." There would have been no war.

In this way only could we really have saved Belgium. For who, looking at that unhappy country now, will claim that with all our efforts and all our sacrifices, we have "saved" her?

The next fact is of course that war does not protect the weak. In Chapter V of this volume I have dealt with that question; here I shall not labor the point, but before I leave it let us have the words of a man who supported the War largely on the basis of the very argument we are answering. Although not persuaded of the value of individual war resistance, Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick has said:

> A modern war to protect the weak—that is a grim jest. See how modern warfare protects the weak: ten million known dead soldiers; three million presumed dead soldiers; thirteen million dead civilians; twenty million wounded; three million prisoners; nine million war orphans; five million war widows; ten million refugees. What can we mean—modern war protecting the weak? [7]

Against this falsehood of "protection" stand the blood-bespattered military annals of dead empires—Babylon, Assyria, Greece, Rome. How many more must rise and fall before men learn at the knee of history this elemental lesson?

One of the most important criticisms of pacifism, though it suffered a bit from the then-current "peace-at-any-price" jargon, was made by Walter Lippmann in 1915, when Mr. Lippmann was energetically persuading his fellow countrymen to adopt *pro tem* a more military policy. Said he:

> The half-civilized aggressors will not be converted. The humane people, the very ones who ought to be influential, are most susceptible to this teaching. They are the desirable members of any international society. But peace-at-any-price means an abdication by them. They resign and leave the world to harder men. Some influence they would no doubt continue to have. But if they succeed in convincing the conquering empires that they will not resist, pacifist democrats must for the present give up hope of acting effectively in world politics. They will not be heard about China, Africa, Central America, if they make it known that under no circumstances will they stand up and fight. . . .
>
> The more serious indictment of the peace-at-any-price propaganda is that its success would mean not the abandonment of force, but the concentration of force in the least democratic empires. The weaker western civilization became, the stronger the despotism would be. For though the pacifists may possibly in the

end convert the despotisms too, they will convert the liberal countries first. They will be accomplishing the very result which every lover of peace ought to dread the most—the focusing of power in the hands of those who are least likely to use it well.[8]

If it is indeed nothing but strong military power that holds "hard men" and military empires back from swallowing up weak countries, how stands the comparison between the weak countries that have been swallowed up and the strong countries which, by war, have been humbled in the dust? This point of view puts altogether too great an emphasis on the factor of military force and understates the importance of economic productivity in the achievement of national power. It overlooks the danger of military strength to any democratic tendencies; the two are utterly incompatible, and the latter has always succumbed to the former. It disregards the patent fact that the "half-civilized" are rarely the aggressors.

The fact is, the chief menace to despots is a possible revolt among their own submerged masses. These can be held in line when a genuine or fancied threat exists from more democratic nations; on the other hand, they yield before the unmenacing influence of pacifist democracy. Everywhere, with less justification than we might wish, rebels in despotic countries have held up the old pacific, non-monarchical United States as a brilliant example. In Tsarist Russia, revolutionary school teachers would point out the United States on a map and say to the children without further comment, "There is a country where people live happily without a Tsar." They could have done no such thing, they would do no such thing, had the United States been a conscript country constituting a menace to Russian nationality; if they had, the teaching would have been entirely futile.

A genuinely democratic country, pacifist in policy, by its mere existence would be a menace to every tyrant in the world —and every tyrant knows it well. They know, too, that any attempts to crush such a country by overwhelming force would bring revolt from within likely to topple them from power. Pacifism constitutes no invitation to conquest; there is a great

deal of truth behind the adjective used by Charles Rann Kennedy in his famous play, *The Terrible Meek.*

III. *Non-coöperation with every war is an attitude which is anarchistic, anti-social,* and *perilous to the state.*

Pacifism has no quarrel with governments as such. It does contend against the power of the state to violate conscience, and it conceives part of its mission to be a fight against tyranny in government wherever autocracy may rear its head. And when it comes to the tyranny of government in war, any ruling authority can often be as harsh and autocratic as that of a recognized despotism. A government which denies citizenship to pacifists and assumes the right to conscript citizens in war regardless of their conscientious opposition is in peril of becoming a tyranny and is doing more to endanger its permanence, as we shall hereinafter see, than any pacifists.

The state always justifies its coercion of pacifists on the ground of necessity, but as William Pitt said many years ago, "Necessity is the argument of tyrants; it is the creed of slaves." However, the philosophical anarchist is a pacifist; but the pacifist need not be an anarchist and only a few are interested in anarchism as a social view. As a rule, unless he belongs to a clannish, primitive religious community, he is above the average in public spirit and eager to coöperate with every forward step of government.

It is curious, therefore, that his assertion of non-coöperation with war should often bring down on his head the charge that he is anti-social. Professor Case comes to the conclusion that until some new facts are adduced to prove to the contrary, "the case for the psycho-physical normality of the conscientious objectors as a *class* may be regarded as clearly established." [9] Another sociologist, speaking not especially of pacifists but of social dissenters and innovators in general, has crisply stated a bit of eternal wisdom:

> We must be cautious about making the reservation that a method may be barred because it seems to be anti-social, for nearly every great step in scientific advance has in its earlier stages had to meet the charge that it was inimical to some vested interest,

religious, political or economic. New truth often wears a hostile aspect, and in actual fact usually is at cross purposes with present beliefs and especially with established interests.[10]

It is probably this customary resentment against "untried" methods which is responsible for the common and usually heated expressions of alarm and horror at the pacifist. This and more. For there is a real issue involved, and no facile answer will suffice. Is every assertion of conscience justified? From the religious point of view this question has been clearly answered by a pacifist:

> If the individual has an unqualified right of conscience then we are in danger of chaos and anarchy. On the other hand, it is obvious that if the state is absolutely sovereign in all realms then an external authority is substituted for the individual conscience, and vital religion becomes impossible for those persons who disagree with the authorities on moral issues. Confronted as we are with the danger of anarchy on the one hand and tyranny on the other, what shall we do? My own opinion concerning this great issue may be summarized briefly as follows: I recognize the necessity of government and believe in obedience to law—even those laws which are disliked and which are regarded as unwise—except in the case of a law which if obeyed would necessitate a supreme violation of conscience and the denial of one's deepest religious convictions.[11]

The government of the United States has recognized this right in the First Amendment to the Constitution, which declares that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." None the less, various administrations have violated that Amendment without hesitation when so disposed, and in recent years, since the World War, the force of this famous safeguard of liberty has been still less.

Nor is it enough to protect the rights of religious conscience only. In allowing war-time non-combatant service to members of pacifist religious sects but denying it to members of non-pacifist sects or to non-religious objectors, the state made a distinction which should have no warrant in ethics, in freedom, in democracy. There is no ground by which, in a country that

has separated church and state, the conscientious scruples of a non-religious objector should be regarded as other than identically with those of any religious person.

Must there be no higher loyalty than that to country? Was the Godly if unchurchly Garrison a traitor when he came out with his declaration of a broader fealty, "My country is the world, my countrymen are all mankind"? Is the intellectual but unreligious person a traitor who believes, as many of them have, "Above all nations is humanity"? Is the believer in a God of love a traitor when he says, as Peter said, "We must obey God rather than men"?

The state is an institution not of divine sanction nor of cosmic permanence. It need not be regarded lightly, but it need not be a fetish. Its test is whether it serves the best interests of mankind. It is partly because the state has grown so sacrosanct that history has been, to adapt a phrase from Norman Angell, "so largely a record of bad accidents."

It was no alien agitator of recent importation, but a certain Thomas Jefferson, hailed by politicians of one great party every four years and both parties at other times, who remarked, "The spirit of resistance to government is so valuable on certain occasions, that I wish it to be always kept alive. It will often be exercised when wrong but better so than not to be exercised at all." Jefferson spoke thus far like a radical, but he went on like a veritable hotspur to add, "What country can preserve its liberties if its rulers are not warned from time to time that the people preserve the spirit of resistance? Let them take arms. The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of tyrants." [12] Such dogmatic incendiarism will get nowhere, and if it were not too late there is no doubt that the Sage of Monticello would run afoul of our present-day patrioteers.

A government, a war-making government most of all, is a handful of persons in control of power. They have behind them in a republic, however, a mandate from the people who elected them to office. This is a sobering thought. It is a serious undertaking for anyone to oppose his will to that of the majority.

Yet it must not be forgotten that an administration in the United States sometimes goes to war against the plain electoral mandate of the people; it was largely so with Lincoln, it was still more largely so with Woodrow Wilson. Even though a majority has sanctioned war by all the evidence that may be ascertained, the pacifists who openly oppose it are voicing not only their own convictions but those of many thousands who have no means of expressing it, or who lack the courage to do so. They serve as the remnant of the people's own conscience, reminding them that after all another way exists and is not to be forgotten in the mad pressure of the present moment.

As a matter of fact, Presidents of the United States have got this country into war even at variance with the law of the land.[18] Can it be so criminal an act for pacifists to violate war laws for the sake of peace?

The most perilous thing for a state is not the sufferance of opposition and criticism, but their suppression. Society has advanced through the persistent efforts of small groups which have braved popular hostility for the sake of the truth as it was seen by them. A minority is of course not always right; but what we have of right we owe to the minorities through which it had to come. That is the onward process of life upon this earth.

Bearing witness to this truth, one commentator has said:

> Whatever the necessities of governmental theory, no man, in actual fact, surrenders his whole being to the state.
>
> Man has a sense of right and wrong. If the state—or its instruments—goes too consistently against that sense, he is stimulated, first to antagonism, and then to resistance. The state is for him sovereign only when his conscience is not stirred against its performance, and whatever brings the conscience of man into opposition to the state must, for the state, be sacred ground—not only by reason of man's duty to himself, but also because of his duty to the state. For in a democracy every citizen must share the responsibility for the development of the government and the compelling of it to do right and to discharge properly its function of so ordering society as to afford the citizens the best possible opportunity to live the good life. He cannot discharge this duty by blind obedi-

ence without examination of the aims and methods of the state. . . .

While the citizen has no right to act with indifference to the well-being of the social whole, nevertheless both his duty to himself and his duty to society may exact resistance to attempted decrees of the sovereign. His very oath to support the Constitution may require that he oppose an attempt to enforce part of it; for such an attempt, if ill-advised, may result in bringing the whole structure of the government crashing down in a welter of debauchery or violence which will jeopardize the continuance of the very fundamental principles on which the organic law is founded.[14]

The story has been told of a member of the European Nazarenes who refused to bear arms in the World War. The General, an Austro-Hungarian officer, began to advise him "in a fatherly way."

Seeing that the Nazarene was not being convinced, he tried to confuse him. "Good," he said, "you say the Gospel does not permit you to bear arms. How then do you agree with the order of Jesus, "To Cæsar what is Cæsar's and to God what is God's?" The Nazarene, who had never previously considered this point, was confused and did not know what to reply. But after a moment, putting off his military cap and uniform at the General's feet, he said,

"These belong to Cæsar; take them. I will keep my soul, which belongs to God." [15]

It is worthy of record that Grotius, whose great book on *The Rights of War and Peace* was issued during the Thirty Years' War (1625), was aware of the viewpoint of non-participation in war and on the whole respected it. He cited the early Christian fathers against war and said, of those under authority, "If they are commanded to join in a war, as often happens, if they are quite clear that the war is unlawful, they ought to abstain." He mentions the Essenes, who would harm no one, and "their imitators the Pythagoreans." "Nor is it a sufficient objection to this," he goes on, "that on the other side there is the danger of disobedience. . . . Disobedience in such a case is less an evil than homicide, and especially the homicide of many innocent persons." But Grotius goes further: "And

even if there can be no doubt as to the justice of the war, it does not seem at all equitable that Christians who are unwilling should be compelled to act as soldiers." [16]

"For the Kingdom of God" says a thoughtful writer on this question, such a truly religious person "will reserve a higher loyalty than for any earthly country, certain that in so doing he will be leading his own state toward that blessed goal. With Hocking, he will conceive of the function of religion as being that of inducing men 'to recognize their abiding city as elsewhere, and, serving God supremely, in whom are the issues of the future as well as the past, compel the state to lose its present life, if need be, that it may save it in the service of a better order.'" [17]

Can a government afford to class as criminal those who are faithfully seeking to serve it thus without self-interest? Can it not accept the specific risks involved for the sake of such a public spirit and its general contagion?

But the citizen should not come begging to the state which is after all his servant. "No state is ever securely founded," insists Professor Laski, "save in the consciences of its citizens. No state, indeed, has a better safeguard against error than respect for those consciences. To treat them as trivial, to regard activity built upon them as moral wrong, is to injure itself far more than it can be injured by them. . . . For no government can, in the long run, ever find an adequate substitute for the individual exercise of active minds." [18] It must be conceded, none the less, that in this respect many a government is desperately willing to try. It was a renowned statesman who said in 1917, unless my memory serves me badly, "There are too many thinking men in America." And he was right. Even one, in time of war, is one too many!

IV. *Pacifism, at best, is merely negative.*

Certain words are used not to induce thought but to escape it. There may be words more overworked in recent years than the word "constructive" but one must doubt it. Once call anything "unconstructive" and you have administered the ultimate condemnation. And pacifism has shared the fate of most

minority conceptions by being labeled thus, or being spoken of as "negative."

A British World War veteran, more profoundly, has written that "conscientious objection to war seems a blind alley; but then every affirmation implies a negative. To contemporaries the Crucifixion must have looked an utter negation." [19]

It is not constructive, perhaps, to put out a dangerous fire; it is not constructive to cut out a dangerous cancer; it is not constructive, then, to abandon war. Pacifism is unquestionably negative; negative in the sense used by the physician who examines an organ and finds it "negative"—that is to say, it is not pathological, it is free from disease and disorder. Only in this sense is pacifism "negative" in the body politic.

But pacifism is in certain ways uniquely positive. Its special contributions to the fight for peace are definite.

1. *Pacifism strikes at man power, the indispensable factor of warfare in all ages.* To state this point so bluntly will perhaps cause fury in the minds of military readers. Yet it is not the military whom we must consider; it is the countless personalities who will be killed or inflamed to hatred or debauched in spirit if we do not put an end to war.

Arguments have flown thick and fast in army and navy circles since the War: technical arguments over the relative importance of battleships and aircraft, of tanks and cavalry, of gas and artillery, of a unified and of a diversified command. But on one point it is possible to secure instantaneous agreement. Machines may multiply the effectiveness of the human unit in war; they never can replace the brains, even if they can to some extent the brawn, required for fighting. "Good men on poor ships are better than poor men on good ships," repeats *The Bluejackets' Manual* of 1927. "It is not an army that we must shape and train for war; it is a nation," said the conscription proclamation of May 18, 1917.[20]

Our resources and our strength have a moral as well as a physical side, and "in war" says Napoleon, "the moral is to the physical as three to one." It is essential that we be morally, as well as physically, organized for national defense. The moral

organization consists in a highly developed national pride and a practical rather than a purely sentimental patriotism, wherein each citizen recognizes and acknowledges the obligation of service to the state and prepares himself to render it.[21]

To strike directly, unapologetically, unswervingly, at preparedness in man power is to strike at the *sine qua non* of battle. Without the bodies of drafted men to feed its hungry maw, the monster of war must wither and starve and die.

2. *Pacifism challenges conscription, the vast impersonal, autocratic system by which alone great modern wars are possible.* It is hardly necessary to dwell on the evil of conscription here; it has been dealt with in an earlier chapter. It is merely important to note that there is no other method than pacifism in the many-sided fight for peace that directly confronts the iniquity and oppression of the great octopus which reaches into homes and factories and farms, which strangles useful productivity, which murks the waters of ethical judgment and stifles conscience wherever it can. If pacifists cannot slay this monster, they serve as the rallying point for those who seek its final extermination and they deny it the freedom of the seas.

That the growth of the war resistance movement is definitely felt abroad, is well shown by the words of Dr. Walter Schücking reporting to a sub-committee of the League of Nations:

> We must realize that the principle of military conscription is passing through a crisis. Does not the fact that the law in several countries exempts conscientious objectors from military service, show that the principle of military conscription has been considerably weakened?

3. *Pacifism, brings war under the severest ethical condemnation.* "Since the beginning of time, it is only the moral values that have endured. Force can support the state only temporarily. When a nation disregards the moral forces and seeks its salvation in the crude clash of arms, it bears within itself the seeds of its own destruction." [22] By the double critique of praise and blame social practices achieve their current status, and an evil system is not readily shaken from its moorings without

sharp condemnation—without, as Bishop McConnell has said, "the furious speech of the prophet." [23]

The alarm of the conservative majority in the Supreme Court over Madame Rosika Schwimmer's pacifism is not without foundation. Said Justice Butler, "The influence of conscientious objectors against the use of military force in the defense of the principles of our government is apt to be more detrimental than their mere refusal to bear arms." For, as a student of nationalism has said, "The mistaken view seems prevalent that an institution is something over and above men and women, controlling them like an external force. There is, however, no superior power over citizens compelling them to fight for their country. The modern military state is simply a phrase to express the fact that the citizens *do* fight as a method of settling international disputes. The system will be abolished as soon as we change the behavior of the individuals." [24]

Frequently those sympathetic with pacifism but not ready to embrace it chafe under what they term its "holier than thou" attitude. It is true that pacifists feel holier than the people they used to be before becoming pacifists. This feeling may develop into either an unconscionable self-adulation or into a great force for ethical advancement, depending on the accord of their lives with their preaching.

Historically, however, there is much to be said for the leverage exerted against unwholesome institutions and modes of group action by the "prophets of doom" and the unsparing criticisms of passionate idealists. The bright vision of a warless world can be upheld most persistently only by those to whom war has become not merely a futile horror but a colossal wrong against man's highest nature. Strong ethical concepts can make headway: "by leadership a common ideal can be made to penetrate the soul of a people and to take complete possession of it." [25]

Conscience is not dependent on the direct recipience of a divine effluvium; it comes from, and is developed by, the stimulus of contact with the ethical attitudes of others and the inspiration to find a finer way of meeting social problems. Just as pacifists have benefited by the ideal of pacifism, so may they

contribute to the satisfaction of others by ceaseless loyalty to it in theory and practice.

4. *Pacifism cuts to the root of the popular dependence on war as a reluctant last resort.* Few people among the masses are so eager for war that they will fight unless convinced that war has become necessary as an ultimate recourse. Given a government determined on war and equipped with the instruments of censorship, propaganda and suppression, and all it needs is such a public state of mind. To persuade a people that everything practical but war has been tried in vain is fairly simple, provided that people are willing to be used for war upon such terms.

When there are large blocks of citizens, however, who see in war not the last resort but no resort at all, the situation is transformed. Governments will have to give up war and try, as never otherwise they will, to find solutions by the ways of peace. Pacifism does not ask for "no more war *unless* . . ." It asks for no more war. It evaluates personality too highly to truckle with a method which reduces man to a bundle of unethical meat and nerves and bones. With Anatole France, it can "have hate only for hatred."

5. *Pacifism pushes governments toward peace.* No government bent on war at the behest of a war party will welcome a pacifist opposition that cannot be cajoled, argued, purchased, threatened, or coerced into support. If it were otherwise, governments would regard the war objector more lightly. The peace movement as a whole has not been of that quality—nor always, for that matter, has pacifism. But there can be no doubt that a government, advised of unalterable opposition, is likely to seek every means of peaceful settlement available, and if these are not at hand it will endeavor to create them.

We must be careful here not to make the case too simple, and speak of governments as if they were always composed of malignant persons entirely without scruple. But nevertheless wars by the hundred have been blundered into or precipitated by men who were either too unimaginative or too unwilling or too traditional or too deeply committed to war policies to make

the heroic effort which the aversion of hostilities required. It is marvelous to see the ingenuity of scientists, educators, preachers, mechanics, and statesmen in devising the means of waging war under emergency pressure. It is not inconceivable that something of the same physical energy and mental power could be applied to peace under emergency pressure from the opposite point of view.

The peace movement can be persuaded into war. The ex-soldiers can be persuaded into war. During the war they sang to the tune of "What a Friend We Have in Jesus,"

> When this wicked war is over,
> No more soldiering for me.

But since the War, so far as their organizations usually go, they have manifested either a readiness for war or a peace sentiment of the most complaisant character.

The war resisters cannot be persuaded. Pacifism, in its various manifestations, is the taproot of peace. To grant it insufficient nourishment in moral support is to let the peace movement grow to top, to be uptorn by any undue winds of strife.

6. *Pacifism contributes to the removal of war's causes by its efforts for inter-racial, international, and economic justice.* Pacifists are not alone in their work against race prejudice, imperialism, and industrial autocracy. But especially since the World War they have been in the forefront of the struggle for justice in every sector, and many of them are indeed unique in the degree to which they have thrown in their lot with the oppressed, the under dogs, the victims of pride and exploitation. The pacifists of many European countries are leaders in the various labor movements; the pacifists of America are increasingly active in the same direction and in the struggle for the rights of colored people. All over the world the pacifist groups are lining up against imperialism. No longer can the fighters for justice honestly point the finger of scorn at the fighters for peace. There may often be disagreement still regarding method; but with the exception of certain conservative and rather afflu-

ent groups, who as yet have moved but slowly toward industrial democracy, there can be no warrantable charge of pacifist inertia.

7. *Pacifism tends to eradicate international fears and bugaboos.* So long as armaments and war exist, so long will nations have nightmares and jumpy nerves. Fear is a poison no less for nations than for individuals.

Demonstrations innumerable have been made of the way in which an acceleration of preparedness in one country has been followed by its duplicate across the border by another. Our own now-defunct Mobilization Day brought in its train a similar day in far Japan, which alas is not defunct. The acquisition of a new weapon in one quarter is invariably the signal for its adoption in another. Like begets like.

Like begets like—love as well as hate, peace as well as war. The presence of a strong and closely knit minority in one country committed against all war and not susceptible to browbeating or mob pressure is a constant insurance against a hasty war by that country on any other. Lord Ponsonby's 130,000 in England is no absolute guarantee against a war by England on Japan; but because of the 130,000 every Japanese can rest that much more at ease. Let the number be still greater, and still greater is the sense of security everywhere. If war resistance can become built up to the point where the strike for peace is a potential check on war in every country, so may the tension lessen and a psychology of peace and security spread among the nations—a security far more real and reassuring than that which rests on legal processes and government-dominated institutions.

8. *Pacifism can be comprehended and applied by the plain, uneducated masses.* It has been proved by the experience of many years that people of simple minds can understand and practice the life of personal and international good will. The Waldensians of the seventeenth century were neither "low-brows" nor "high-brows," but they impressed learned observers with the sterling quality of their souls and lives. The saints and prophets of all times have found a response among the

earthy, homely folk to whom elaborate treatises on ethics would be incomprehensible.

These are the people without whom, to-day or to-morrow, war cannot be abolished. To these people war resistance will inevitably come as a shock and will induce at first a hostile attitude; but there need be no concern over that. All great reforms and revolutions in men's ways and thought have had to encounter resistance from the folk-mind; but the folk-mind is not the least adaptive nor the least inclined toward good will.

We may not have a high regard for the intellectual viewpoint of the nobodies, but as Horace Traubel the biographer of Whitman once declared, they are in many respects "the supreme influences." In a study of the phenomenon known euphemistically as "national honor" a penetrating young writer previously quoted has asked us to "abandon the profound academic discussions and expositions of the merits of internationalism, all that abstract argument for peace which persuades, and perhaps only temporarily, only those who are already persuaded and does not reach the great 'voiceless masses' who do the fighting."

I cannot agree that we should abandon the detailed and intellectual discussions of knotty problems; we must pay them more heed, not less. But these are for the experts, and it is folly to reach the common people with them. I well recall hearing an official speaker for an organization promoting the League of Nations. Not only did he take pains to show that war was still a necessity, but he pleaded earnestly that the American people devote long hours of study to develop a familiarity with the workings of the League. "To understand complicated and difficult institutions, such as the League," he exclaimed, "demands long, hard work." It does indeed from anyone; and by the average workingman those hours will never be so spent. His attention to such questions must of necessity be limited, almost as much so as that of the "busy" social butterfly.

He can, however, comprehend the hideous wrong and folly of war and can sense his power to stop it by the strike for peace. He knows the possible efficacy of "down tools." He can

be won by simple appeals to a simple, direct attack on war. This is not sentimental democratic nonsense; it has been proved by war resisters of the past and is proved to-day by the hard-handed men who everywhere constitute the rank and file of war-resisting movements.

9. *Pacifism furnishes a moral, dramatic, and heroic equivalent for war.* The campaign for peace can be no tame, anemic undertaking. It will never bring behind its banners the brave and robust-minded youth of this and later generations unless it makes its hard demands, unless it offers danger and the thrill of conflict. "Youth will be satisfied all along the line only by something unconventional, adventurous, heroic." [26]

Here indeed the pacifist way of living and the pacifist fight for peace have unique elements of appeal. Even in the most liberal, non-conscript countries, the life of pacifists is never without spirit and color, the zest of struggle, risk and sacrifice. It is the usual life of those who throw themselves behind unpopular causes. They must expect to run the risk of pecuniary disadvantage, insecurity, social ostracism, even in times of peace; their lot in war I have already hinted. Only for the morally sturdy is the way of pacifism, and only those who are capable of endurance in the face of hardship and heart-breaking discouragements, the loss of friends and the diminution of prestige should set their feet upon that uphill road of joyous, perilous adventure.

In the forefront of the fight for peace, however, there is room for valiant spirits; and that is not the least of pacifism's value. In the words of a social scientist:

> The dispositions of pugnacity and competition will, so far as we can see, continue indefinitely as part of the human endowment; but there is no good reason why they should not be canalized for constructive ends. The heroic impulse will not perish if supplied with appropriate moral and physical equivalents for armed combat.[27]

10. *Pacifism enriches the personalities of those who learn increasingly to trust its methods in their own experience.*

Bernard Shaw has testified that socialism made a man of him. What he meant will be understood by anyone who has studied the effects of great causes on the lives of those who worked for them devotedly. Not always are these influences altogether lovely; narrow-mindedness, harshness of judgment, imputation of evil motives, bickering, exaggeration of one's own program to the belittlement of every other irrespective of sound facts—all these are not uncommon traits of persons who espouse some great reform.

On the other hand, such characteristics tend to become associated with those who press for reforms which involve a dominance of one personality-type over others. Pacifism seeks no power to hold men under an iron rule; it works neither by legislation nor by decree. Its method is the penetration of good will into the hearts of its foes; even in its non-coöperative aspects there is no demand for regimented living. It cannot win out by imposition of its will except as its insistence, from its non-violent good will and truth-force, evokes good will as a response. Even the strike for peace, conducted as a dictatorial and purely selfish imposition of power, could never win the world from war.

But pacifism is not this so much, deep in its philosophic outlook, as it is a dedication to a whole new way of living with one's fellow creatures.

> More important than the fact that he is seeking a different goal from some and feels compelled to use different methods from others is his commitment to a way of life that in itself is creative of brotherhood and unity. To him, it is not just a casual choice between various interesting objectives in life or a matter of expediency in the methods to be followed. Behind all that is the urge to achieve a unity with the universe in which he lives and to build his life into a deepening harmony with all that is deepest and truest in this evolving world. In repudiating the methods and machinery of war and exploitation he is merely clearing the way for the far larger task of laying, stone by stone, the foundations of a friendly, coördinating society in which men will be united by common projects instead of being separated by competing fears.[28]

The corner stone of these foundations is love. Let those scorn who will, or cry out "sentimentalism," love is an art which can create its artists out of those who try to practice it, however humbly and inadequately. A fine, transcendent cause must always be its own supreme reward to those who labor for it; there is no worthier, higher cause than pacifism.

CHAPTER XXVI

CREATIVE PEACE

Would you end war?
Create great Peace . . .
JAMES OPPENHEIM, in *War and Laughter.*

CHAPTER XXVI

CREATIVE PEACE

THE fight for peace has not been won. Yet there is hardly need for pessimism. Rome was not builded in a day; still less the city of love.

Realism we need; idealism we need; cynicism we can do without. A compendium of military minds could easily be found to prove war's everlasting permanence. We must escape that paralyzing sense of futility which enervates our thought, that defeatist temptation of which H. N. Brailsford writes:

> Deep in the nerve centres even of the most civilized men, there lurks an expectation which makes fatalists of us. What has once happened will happen again. This dim, half-formulated belief pursues us alike in our personal lives and in our reading of history. It is a fear which ensures the fulfilment of its own predictions.[1]

But on the other hand there may be equal danger in a facile optimism. The peace movement has been characterized far less by cynical despair than bright mirages which it mistook for the harbor of success. In 1838 it was possible for the American Peace Society to assert, "We have good reasons, though no room to state them, for believing that pacific views and feelings are silently, yet surely pervading every nation in christendom." "The war spirit," it decided, "is checked." Across the Atlantic in 1837 Baron de Jomini, Aide-de-Camp General to His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, wrote that

> There is perhaps some temerity in publishing a work upon war, at the moment when the apostles of perpetual peace alone are heard.[2]

Victor Hugo in the middle of the nineteenth century predicted that "in the twentieth century war will be dead." In the latter part of 1899 Sidney Low, writing in *The Nineteenth Century,* noted that there had been no war among the European powers "for eight and twenty years, and it almost seems as if there never could be one again." A speaker roused the emotions of a great arbitration conference in 1911 by his assurance that "the one word that is on all men's lips to-day is the brotherhood of man." Almost on the brink of the world's greatest conflict Lord Haldane declared at Holborn, London, January 15, 1914, that while Europe was an armed camp, it was an armed camp in which peace not only prevailed but in which "the indications were that there was a far greater prospect of peace than ever there was before."

And now, moved by the progress made in frightfulness, a distinguished leader in the American Chemical Society has recently declared that "modern chemistry plus modern aeronautics has made war impossible";[3] while a liberal church leader, moved by the genuine gains for peace in recent years has written in roseate lines:

> They have built peace, these men of the new age,
> On sure foundations. Let the Hague declare
> Their faith, Locarno and Geneva bear
> Witness to the stout hope that turned the page
> Of fifty centuries, and to the rage
> And waste of war wrote Finis. . . .[4]

May it indeed be true! But we dare not go about the labors of everyday life, the productive effort that enables mankind to establish homes and sustain new generations and pry knowledge out of ignorance and carry on the race toward a lofty destination—we dare not do it all on any such assumption. Peace will ever have to be *renewal.*

"To think of progress," says John Morley, "as a certainty is superstitious—the most splendid and animated of all superstitions, if you like, yet a superstition still. It is a kind of fatalism—radiant, confident, and infinitely hopeful, yet fatalism still, and like fatalism in all its other forms, inevitably

dangerous to the effective sense of individual responsibility." And whence comes progress when we have it? The same writer who quotes Viscount Morley answers: "Progress is not written into the nature of things; it comes, if at all, as the fruitage of conscious and persistent human effort."

If I were a dictator guiding the war against war, I should shoot all pessimists at sunset and all optimists at dawn. The future is not "the present, pushed along." We need not look at good things done or failures suffered, and suppose that any single tendency is going to dominate the years to come. One way the race may go; another way it may go just as possibly.

"If progression halts," Professor Shapley says (with admirable nonchalance) "we go to join the dinosaurs."

> If stagnation enters, in a million years or so, by the light of these undisturbed stars that heed life not at all, some conservative cockroach, crawling over the fossilized skull of an extinct primate, may be able to observe: "A relic here of another highly specialized organism which failed to recognize the laws of the universe, which preferred the current minor whims to the search for survival, and which missed its great opportunity to inherit the planet, perishing an early victim of the world's subtle chemistries." [5]

Can the race avert this rather annoying fate? No one can say. There is sustaining faith in the power that flowered within the human breast a capacity for love and generous action, even if not those qualities alone. Whether the stars fight in their courses for us, as many dare believe, or whether we struggle lonely and unaided beneath their barren gleams, struggle we must, in confidence at least that love is a law of universal potency and that the issue is the life of love or else the death of Man.

Only by creative thought and labor can Great Peace be wrought. In our pathway lie the vast mountainous inertias which only social passion will give us leverage to lift: the dominance of dead ideals; prejudice that keeps injustice still enthroned; greed that lives in the hearts of good men as well as bad; the seeds of hate that lie unseen in the very soil on which

we stand to proclaim the sun of the new day; the secret fears that beset the human spirit, holding men's feet frozen to old ways, their backs bent low in reverence for ancient idols.

Can peace be made a folk enterprise, a portentous adventure of discovery, a conflict less for the safety of those who battle for progress in any generation than for the safety of Man upon this planet? Can the peace forces wrest from war its least excuse for being, by grappling with the world as it is and shaping it to serve a more exacting race? Can the fighters for peace reach out into the realities of the future and lay upon them so unrelaxing a grasp that all men are drawn out of the grim realities of the present? That is the creative task, the impossibly creative task, that Man must prove is possible. That is the work that Man must do, that Man will do because he has to. Out of his need he can generate a spirit that works within him and drives him on, reckless of losses, quailing before no hard defeats, to control his destiny so far as work and will may conquer.

No more than the resolute man of war requires a personal victory need the fighter for peace demand a similar assurance. He will lean against the gales of opposition, flinging his tocsin back to successive generations if need be, till somewhere along the unfathomable highway of the years the city of love will lie before men's eyes.

When his children's children take possession of their heritage, they will find it a city built by the toil of countless unsung pioneers, by those who asked no profits but the glory of high purpose which burned in their brains, who sought no badge of honor save the callouses of honest labor that kept their hands from softness.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

Conflicts since the Beginning of the Organized Peace Movement

NOTE: Only by an arbitrary and unsatisfactory selection is it possible to separate the disturbances of sufficient size and political significance from unimportant conflicts. This list is admittedly inadequate and doubtless is not free from numerous errors of commission and omission. Considered as preliminary to a thorough study which may some day be made, it may have a certain value in revealing the general tendency toward violent struggle. In the list, wars of great magnitude are printed in capital letters; smaller but large scale conflicts in italics; and comparatively minor outbreaks in ordinary type. Innumerable bombardments, coups, riots, massacres and interventions are left out entirely.

(1792)–1815. NAPOLEONIC WARS
(1810)–1822. *Revolt of Spanish Colonies in South America,* Venezuela, Ecuador, Colombia (New Granada), Peru, La Plata, Chile, Uruguay, Paraguay, Mexico
(1812)–1815. *War between United States and Great Britain*
1816–1818. *Second War of Great Britain against the Mahrattas in India*
1817–1818. First War of United States against Seminole Indians
1820–1834. Revolts in Portugal
1821. Revolution in Naples
1821. Insurrection in Piedmont against Austria
1821–1822. Conquest of French Haiti by native Haitians
1821–1829. WAR OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE. Greece, England, France and Russia against Turkey
1822–1823. Revolt in Spain against King Ferdinand VII, who was restored by aid of French troops
1824–1826. First War of Great Britain against Burma
1830. Revolution in France
1830–1832. *Revolution in Poland*
1830–1833. *Belgian revolt against union with Holland*
1831. Insurrection in the Papal States
1832. Black Hawk Indian War in the United States
1832–1833. War between Egypt and Turkey
1833. Revolt in Portugal
1833–1840. *Civil War in Spain*
1835–1842. Second War of United States against Seminole Indians
1836. Alamo Massacre and Defeat of Mexicans by Texans
1837–1838. Insurrection in Canada

1839. Northeastern Boundary engagements between New England and New Brunswick
1839–1841. *War against Egypt by Turkey, aided by Russia, Great Britain, Austria and Prussia*
1839–1842. *First of Great Britain's Afghan Wars*
1840–1842. *Great Britain's Opium War with China*
1842. Dorr Insurrection in Rhode Island
1844. War of France against Morocco
1844–1849. Establishment of Santo Domingo; subsequent revolutions in Haiti
1845–1846. First of Great Britain's Sikh Wars in India
1846. Attempted rebellion in Poland
1846–1848. *War between United States and Mexico*
1847. War on the Sonderbund in Switzerland by the Swiss Confederacy
1848. *General European Revolutions,* in France, Berlin, Vienna, Lombardy, Sicily, Naples, Denmark, Poland, Bohemia, Hungary, with disorders in Ireland and elsewhere
1848–1849. *Great Britain's Second Sikh War in India*
1848–1849. *War between Austria and Sardinia*
1848–1851. *Three Wars of Schleswig-Holstein, with Austria and Russia, against Denmark*
1849. *War between Austria and Hungary*
1849–1861. War against American Indians in Texas and New Mexico
1850. Insurrection in Bosnia against Turkey
1850–1864. *Tai-ping Revolt in China*
1851. Insurrections in Cuba
1851. Louis Napoleon's *coup d'état,* Paris
1851–1864. War between Russians and Circassians
1851–1853. Revolt of Kaffirs and Hottentots against British at Cape of Good Hope
1851–1856. War of United States with American Indians in Oregon
1852–1859. War between Argentine Confederation and Buenos Ayres
1852–1853. War between Montenegrins and Turks
1853. Insurrection in Milan
1853. Revolution in Mexico
1853. Insurrection in Switzerland
1853–1856. CRIMEAN WAR, with Great Britain, France, Turkey and Piedmont against Russia
1854. Insurrection in Spain
1855–1857. Filibustering War in Nicaragua and Costa Rica
1855–1858. Further War with American Indians in Florida
1856–1857. War of Great Britain against Persia
1856–1860. *War of Great Britain and France against China*
1857–1858. *Sepoy Mutiny, Cawnpore Massacre, etc., in India*
1858. Revolution in Mexico
1858. Revolution in Haiti
1858. War between Turkey and Montenegro

1859. Civil War in Venezuela
1859. Revolution in Costa Rica
1859–1860. War of Spain against Morocco
1859–1861. *War of Austria against Sardinia and France*
1860. War of France against the Druses in Syria
1861–1865. CIVIL WAR IN THE UNITED STATES
1862. French War against Annam and conquest of Cochin China
1862. Warfare between Turks and Serbs
1862. Revolt in Greece
1862–1863. Sioux Indian War in the United States
1862–1867. *War of France against Mexico*
1862–1890. Intermittent wars and massacres between United States and American Indians
1863–1864. Insurrection in Russia, Poland and Lithuania
1863–1869. War in United States against Cheyenne, Arapahoe, Kiowa, and Comanche Indians
1864. *War of Austria and Prussia against Denmark*
1865–1870. WAR OF ARGENTINA, BRAZIL AND URUGUAY AGAINST PARAGUAY
1865. Revolt in Haiti
1866. *Seven Weeks' War, Prussia and Italy against Austria*
1866. Revolt of Crete against Turkey
1867. Garibaldi's Revolt in Italy
1867. Revolt in Greece
1867–1868. War of Great Britain against Abyssinia
1868. Revolution in Spain
1868–1878. *Revolt in Cuba against Spanish rule*
1868–1869. *Civil War in Japan*
1870. Rebellion in Canada
1870. Capture of Rome by Italian troops
1870–1871. FRANCO-PRUSSIAN WAR
1871. *Insurrection in France*
1871. *Revolution in Mexico*
1871. Punitive attack by American and French forces against Korea
1872. Revolt in Montenegro
1872. War between Honduras and San Salvador
1872. Revolt in Peru
1872–1873. Modoc Indian War in the United States
1872–1875. *Carlist War in Spain*
1873. War of the Netherlands against Acheen
1873–1874. War between Great Britain and Ashanti
1874. Revolt in Nagasaki
1875. Insurrection in Bosnia and Herzegovina against Turkey
1876. Sioux and Cheyenne Uprisings in the United States
1876–1878. WAR OF RUSSIA, MONTENEGRO (*and earlier* SERBIA) AGAINST TURKEY
1877. Insurrections in Greece
1877. Nez Perces Indian War in the United States
1878–1881. Great Britain's Second Afghan War

1879. *War between Chili and Peru*
1879. *Great Britain's Zulu War*
1880. Insurrectionary uprisings in Ireland
1880–1881. *Great Britain's First Boer War*
1881. French Conquest of Tunis
1881–1883. Massacres of Jews in Russia
1882. Egyptian Revolt against Great Britain
1882–1886. Apache Indian War in the United States
1883. Revolt in Spain
1883. Revolt in Crete
1883–1885. *War between the Egyptian (British) Government and the Sudanese*
1883–1895. French Conquest of Madagascar
1884. Rebellion in Egypt
1884–1885. War between France and Indo-China
1885. Rebellion in Roumelia
1885. Russians fighting with Afghans
1885. Revolt in Panama
1885. Revolt in Saskatchewan, Canada
1885–1886. War between Serbia and Bulgaria
1887–1895. War of Italy against Abyssinia
1888–1889. Civil War in Haiti
1889. Insurrection in Hawaii
1889. Insurrection in Brazil
1889–1893. German Conquest of German Southwest Africa
1890–1891. Sioux Indian uprising in the United States
1890. Insurrection in Buenos Ayres
1890. War between Druses and Maronites in Syria
1890. War between Guatemala and San Salvador, involving Honduras
1890–1892. Wars between France and Dahomey
1891. Revolt in Portugal
1891. Revolt in Manipur, Assam, against British rule
1891. Revolt in Caroline Islands against Spain
1891. Civil War in Chili
1891–1893. Revolution in Brazil
1892. Revolt in Morocco against French rule
1892. Revolution in Venezuela
1892. Revolt in Crete
1892–1893. Revolts in Argentina
1893. Revolution in Hawaii
1893. Revolt in Nicaragua
1893. Fighting between French and Siamese
1893–1894. *Great Britain's Matabele War*
1894. Kaffir rebellion in Portuguese East Africa
1894–1895. *War between China and Japan*
1894–1895. Turkish massacres of Armenians
1895. Revolt in Peru
1895. Insurrection in Cuba

1895. Jameson Raid against Boers in South Africa
1895–1896. Massacres of Armenians by Turks
1896. Revolt in Philippines against Spanish rule
1896. Matabele uprising against British in Africa
1896–1897. Revolt in Crete, with intervention of Greece against Turkish rule, and Turkish-Greek War
1897. British conquest of Nigeria
1897. Uprisings of Waziri and Afridi tribesmen in India against British rule
1897. Revolt in Guatemala
1898. *Great Britain's recovery of the Sudan*
1898. *Cuban Rebellion and Spanish-American War*
1899. Revolution in Venezuela
1899–1901. *Filipino Insurrection against United States rule*
1899–1902. *Great Britain's Second Boer War*
1900. Boxer Uprising in China
1901–1902. Revolution in Colombia, aided by Venezuela, and followed by revolt in Venezuela
1902. Civil War in Haiti
1902. *British forces in sharp conflicts in Somaliland, Sokoto, Nigeria and elsewhere in Africa*
1903. Insurrection in Panama against Colombia, aided by the United States
1903. New Massacres of Jews in Russia
1904. *War of Great Britain and Tibet*
1904. Revolt of Herreros in German Southwest Africa
1904–1905. RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR
1905–1906. *Revolutionary Uprisings in Russia*
1906. Revolt in Ecuador
1906. Battles with Moros in the Philippine Islands
1906. Revolt in Cuba
1906. Conflicts between Dutch and Malays
1907. Japan's Conquest of Korea
1907. Revolt in Morocco against France
1907–1909. Revolt in Persia
1908. Warfare between Italy and Abyssinians in Somaliland
1908. Civil War in Morocco
1908. Revolution in Haiti
1908. Warfare between Portuguese and natives in Guinea
1908–1909. Revolutions in Turkey
1908–1912. Rebellion in Algeria and Morocco; Moorish warfare against French and Spanish
1909. Revolt in Santo Domingo
1909. Revolution in Colombia
1909–1910. Revolutions in Nicaragua
1909–1911. Revolts in Albania
1910. Revolution in Portugal
1911. Warfare between Peruvian and Bolivian forces
1911–1912. *Revolution in China*

1911–1912. *War between Italy and Turkey*
1911–1914. *Revolutions in Mexico*
1912. Revolution in Paraguay
1912. BALKAN WAR
1912. Civil War in Santo Domingo, followed by United States intervention
1913. Revolt in Turkey
1913. *Second Balkan War*
1914. Revolution in Peru
1914. Rebellion in Albania
1914–1916. Punitive expeditions of the United States into Mexico
1914–1918. **WORLD WAR**
1917. *Revolutions in Russia*
1917–1923. Suppression of Irish Revolt by British troops; Civil War in Ireland
1918–1919. *Civil War in Finland*
1918–1919. Revolts in Portugal
1918–1919. Uprisings in Spain
1918–1920. *Civil War in Russia, and several wars of intervention by World War Allies, behind Kolchak, Denikin, Wrangel, Yudenitch,* etc.
1919. Revolt in Bavaria
1919. Revolt in Korea against Japan
1919. Revolt in Egypt against Great Britain
1919. Revolution in Hungary, followed by war with Jugoslavia, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia
1919. Massacre of Indians at Amritsar
1919–1921. Capture of Fiume by D'Annunzio and recapture by Italian government
1920. Kapp counter-revolt in Berlin
1920. *War between Russia and Poland*
1920. White Terror in Hungary against Jews and Socialists
1921. Revolt in Persia
1921. War of Russia and Bessarabia
1921–1922. *War between Turkey and Greece*
1921–1922. Conflict between Communists and Fascisti in Italy, followed by Fascist seizure of power
1921–1926. *Revolt among Riff tribes, followed by war of French and Spanish against Riffians*
1922. Warfare in India originating in conflict of Moplahs with Hindus
1922. War in China between Chang Tso-lin and Wu Pei-fu
1922–1924. French and Belgian occupation of the Ruhr
1923. Revolt in Bulgaria
1923. Revolt in Greece
1923. Bombardment of Corfu by Italy
1923. Revolution in Spain
1923. Revolt in Bavaria
1923–1924. Rebellion in Mexico

1924. Revolt in Brazil
1924–1926. War-lord conflicts in China
1925–1926. France's war against the Druses in Syria
1926. Revolts in Greece
1926. Revolt in Spain
1926. Revolution in Portugal
1926-1929. *Chinese Revolutions*
1927. Uprisings in Mexico
1927–1928. Combative intervention by United States in Nicaragua
1928–1929. Revolution in Afghanistan
1928–1929. Fighting between French and natives in South Morocco
1929. Punitive expedition of British against Arabs
1929. Various outbreaks of internal warfare in China
1929. Revolt in Persia
1929. Battles between Italians and rebels in Tripoli
1929. Fighting between Derajat column of British-led troops and natives in Mahsud region, India
1929. Sorties and conflicts in Manchuria, between Chinese and Soviet Russian troops

SUMMARY 1815–1929

Wars of Great Magnitude	9
Large-Scale Conflicts	49
Minor Conflicts	194
TOTAL, IN 114 YEARS	252

APPENDIX II

Summary of Causes of 286 Wars
As Stated by
the Massachusetts Peace Society's Committee of Inquiry, 1820:

First. *"Wars of ambition*—to obtain extent of territory by conquest. We have enumerated 44 wars of magnitude of this class—12 in which the assailants have been Heathen or Mahometan, and Christian nations defendants; and all the others, we regret to say, have been attacks made by nations professing Christianity on others, without any decent pretense or color of right. In 17 instances the assailing nation has been completely victorious—in 19 instances the assailing nation has been repulsed—and in 8 the assailants have obtained partial augmentations of territory secured by peace."

Second. "Predatory wars—for plunder, or tribute, or to obtain a settlement for subsistence."—"We have enumerated 22 in all." "The invasions have commonly ended in repulse; but seldom without effecting some mischief."

Third. *"Wars of revenge or retaliation*—We enumerate 24 of them; of which 5 have been successful—4 partially successful—13 unsuccessful, the assailants having been repelled—and 2 left undetermined by circumstances, and gave rise to new wars."

Fourth. *"Wars to settle some question of honor or prerogative."* Of this class "We record 8 wars; in 4 of which the point of honor was gained—3 were settled by compromise—1 submitted to a council."

Fifth. *"Wars arising from disputed claims to some territory."* Six only are enumerated. "Of these the party occupying the territory in question preserved it in 2 instances—in the other 4, partition arrangements were made."

Sixth. *"Wars arising from disputed titles to crowns.* We have enumerated 41 wars of this class; in 18 instances the party claiming the throne recovered it from the party in possession—in 18 instances the possessor of the throne maintained it, and in 2 of these the assailants lost their own crowns in aiming at others; and in 5 other instances the results were undecisive, and the parties pacified by compromise or partition."

Seventh. *"War commenced under the pretense of assisting some ally, or some friend or person flying from alleged oppression.* We have found 30 of these wars; in 18 of which the assailing or protecting party have been victorious—in 6 the defendants have maintained their ground or defeated the assailants; and 6 have terminated unde-

cisively in what is called the *statu quo*—or in compromise at a general peace."

Eighth. *"Wars which have arisen from the distrust of nations toward each other—jealousy of rival greatness, or fear of increasing armaments or extended conquests.*—23 wars of this description have been observed within our limits.—In 11 of them the allies or assailants have been successful—7 of them have been ended by compromise or treaty, generally placing the parties where they were when they began; and 5 have resulted in the defeat of the coalition and the further aggrandizement of the obnoxious power."

Ninth. *"Wars which have grown out of commerce, designed for its protection against foreign depredations.* We have found but 5 wars of this class.—Neither of them have resulted in greater security to the commerce molested; 2 have given victory to the encroaching power; and 3 have been extinguished by a general peace, leaving the commercial injuries unatoned for."

Tenth. *"Civil wars, carried on by different parties in the same nation.*—We record 55 of this class—in 21 the rebelling party has overthrown those who were at the commencement in possession of power, or established a separate independence; 28 have resulted in the suppression of rebellion, and the confirmation of power to the party possessing it; 5 have been terminated by compromise—allowing new privileges to the claimants—and 1 between Spain and the revolted provinces in South America—yet undetermined."

Eleventh. *"Wars on account of religion.* We have noticed 28 wars of this class—7 called Crusades, by Christian powers to expel Mahometans from countries esteemed holy—5 by Mahometans on Christian nations—2 by Christian nations to compel their neighbors to become Christians—11 by Popes or bigoted monarchs to reduce those they deemed heretics—and 3 to recover territory from the hands of infidels—in 14 instances the oppressing or assailing parties have been victorious—in 9 the defendants maintained their religion and their territories—and in 5, no decisive result, but a compromise or temporary peace terminated the conflicts."

APPENDIX III

The Pact of Paris

THE PRESIDENT OF THE GERMAN REICH, THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, HIS MAJESTY THE KING OF THE BELGIANS, THE PRESIDENT OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC, HIS MAJESTY THE KING OF GREAT BRITAIN, IRELAND AND THE BRITISH DOMINIONS BEYOND THE SEAS, EMPEROR OF INDIA, HIS MAJESTY THE KING OF ITALY, HIS MAJESTY THE EMPEROR OF JAPAN, THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND, THE PRESIDENT OF THE CZECHOSLOVAK REPUBLIC.

Deeply sensible of their solemn duty to promote the welfare of mankind;

Persuaded that the time has come when a frank renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy should be made to the end that the peaceful and friendly relations now existing between their peoples may be perpetuated;

Convinced that all changes in their relations with one another should be sought only by pacific means and be the result of a peaceful and orderly process, and that any signatory Power which shall hereafter seek to promote its national interests by resort to war should be denied the benefits furnished by this Treaty;

Hopeful that, encouraged by their example, all the other nations of the world will join in this humane endeavor and by adhering to the present Treaty as soon as it comes into force bring their peoples within the scope of its beneficent provisions, thus uniting the civilized nations of the world in a common renunciation of war as an instrument of their national policy;

Have decided to conclude a Treaty and for that purpose have appointed as their respective Plenipotentiaries

THE PRESIDENT OF THE GERMAN REICH:
Dr. Gustav Stresemann, Minister for Foreign Affairs;

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:
The Honorable Frank B. Kellogg, Secretary of State;

HIS MAJESTY THE KING OF THE BELGIANS:
Mr. Paul Hymans, Minister for Foreign Affairs, Minister of State;

THE PRESIDENT OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC:
Mr. Aristide Briand, Minister for Foreign Affairs;

HIS MAJESTY THE KING OF GREAT BRITAIN, IRELAND AND THE BRITISH DOMINIONS BEYOND THE SEAS, EMPEROR OF INDIA: FOR

GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations:
The Right Honourable Lord Cushendun, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Acting Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs;
For the DOMINION OF CANADA:
The Right Honourable William Lyon Mackenzie King, Prime Minister and Minister for External Affairs;
For the COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA:
The Honourable Alexander John McLachlan, Member of the Executive Federal Council;
For the DOMINION OF NEW ZEALAND:
The Honourable Sir Christopher James Parr, High Commissioner for New Zealand in Great Britain;
For the UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA:
The Honourable Jacobus Stephanus Smit, High Commissioner for the Union of South Africa in Great Britain;
For the IRISH FREE STATE:
Mr. William Thomas Cosgrave, President of the Executive Council;
For INDIA:
The Right Honourable Lord Cushendun, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Acting Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs;

HIS MAJESTY THE KING OF ITALY:
Count Gaetano Manzoni, his Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary at Paris;

HIS MAJESTY THE EMPEROR OF JAPAN:
Count Uchida, Privy Councillor;

THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND:
Mr. A. Zaleski, Minister for Foreign Affairs;

THE PRESIDENT OF THE CZECHOSLOVAK REPUBLIC:
Dr. Eduard Benés, Minister for Foreign Affairs;
who, having communicated to one another their full powers found in good and due form have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE I

The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another.

ARTICLE II

The High Contracting Parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means.

ARTICLE III

The present Treaty shall be ratified by the High Contracting Parties named in the Preamble in accordance with their respective constitutional requirements, and shall take effect as between them as soon as all their several instruments of ratification shall have been deposited at Washington.

This Treaty shall, when it has come into effect as prescribed in the preceding paragraph, remain open as long as may be necessary for adherence by all the other Powers of the world. Every instrument evidencing the adherence of a Power shall be deposited at Washington and the Treaty shall immediately upon such deposit become effective as between the Power thus adhering and the other Powers parties hereto.

It shall be the duty of the Government of the United States to furnish each Government named in the Preamble and every Government subsequently adhering to this Treaty with a certified copy of the Treaty and of every instrument of ratification or adherence. It shall also be the duty of the Government of the United States telegraphically to notify such Governments immediately upon the deposit with it of each instrument of ratification or adherence.

IN FAITH WHEREOF the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this Treaty in the French and English languages both texts having equal force, and hereunto affix their seals.

DONE at Paris, the twenty-seventh day of August in the year one thousand nine hundred and twenty-eight.

(SEAL)	GUSTAV STRESEMANN
(SEAL)	FRANK B. KELLOGG
(SEAL)	PAUL HYMANS
(SEAL)	ARI. BRIAND
(SEAL)	CUSHENDUN
(SEAL)	W. L. MACKENZIE KING
(SEAL)	A. J. MCLACHLAN
(SEAL)	C. J. PARR
(SEAL)	J. S. SMIT
(SEAL)	LIAM T. MACCOSGAIR
(SEAL)	CUSHENDUN
(SEAL)	G. MANZONI
(SEAL)	UCHIDA
(SEAL)	AUGUST ZALESKI
(SEAL)	DR. EDWARD BENES

APPENDIX IV

William Ladd on Early Tactics

In connection with the foregoing Report, it may not be amiss here to advert to the views which have been entertained by some of the Directors, in respect to the most promising mode of laying the cause of peace before the public. Heretofore the friends of this cause in general, and perhaps our own Society, have placed much dependence on philanthropy, and implored her aid in furtherance of our holy designs. For this purpose we depicted, in glowing colors, the infinite horrors and enormities of war. But in vain. Philanthropy sighed over the revolting scene, and it passed quickly from her view, and her sympathies became engrossed with other objects. Turning then to the political economist, we claimed his attention, while we pointed to the impoverished nations of Europe, pressed down by burdens brought on them by wars, with all the necessaries of life taxed to the utmost to support those monstrous burdens, and warned our countrymen to beware. But the warning has been vain. Our fellow citizens feel not those burdens, but, on the contrary, regard them existing, as they do in Europe, as the great cause of the flourishing condition of our own manufacturers—and what, at the most, might have been hoped for from a passion so low as the love of money? Not wonderful is it, that we there were disappointed. Next, on patriotism and the love of liberty we called. We showed, from all history, that republics have lost their liberty by becoming involved in war, foreign or domestic; and we pointed out the Cæsars, Cromwells, and Napoleons, who have trampled on the necks of their countrymen and

"Swam to empire through a sea of blood."

But patriotism answered, "War is necessary for putting down tyrants"; not considering, that where one tyrant has been put down by war, three have sprung up—that increasing virtue and knowledge is the way to depose tyrants, and war is the enemy of them both—that men love glory more than they do liberty, and would rather be victorious though slaves, than freemen in peace. At length, relying more fully and perfectly on Christianity and the clearly revealed will of God, we have appealed mainly and directly to the Church of Jesus Christ, the followers of the Prince of Peace. We have aimed, more exclusively, to hold up to the Christian's view when it stretches far beyond this sublunary world into the regions of eternal award, the miserable victims of war hurled as by horrid whirlwinds, into the presence of their final Judge, reeking with guilt and filled with mad-

dening wo, hurried away in the act of breaking all of his commands. We have showed war as a chief obstacle to the spread of religion at home—a formidable hindrance to growth in grace—a sure extinguisher of revivals of religion—the ally and patron of intemperance, Sabbath-breaking, robbery, licentiousness, lewdness, slavery, murder, and every other evil work. We have shown how immeasurably war, and the prevalent spirit of war, obstructs the conversion of the heathen, and the predicted renovation of the world. We have shown, that whatever Christianity will require of men hereafter, it requires of men everywhere now—that Christianity, received in its purity and practised in its integrity, and this alone, is to occasion the introduction and establishment of universal and permanent peace—and that, consequently, the prevailing apathy regarding war, the love and practice of war by Christians, is a deadly malady in the church—an incubus of death, paralyzing the energy of "the body of Christ"—a calamity and crime, unfortunate for the interests of man, and hateful in the eyes of God. We have shown how utterly improbable it is that the heathen will come numerously into the fold of Christ, so long as Christian people not only continue to shed, but to be the foremost in shedding, each other's blood; and we have uttered our deep conviction, that JEHOVAH, whose title is, "THE GOD OF PEACE," will not suffer the nations to be converted to—that huge anomaly!—a fighting Christianity—that it is the duty and the privilege of all men to imitate Christ and the primitive Christians, who always from all fighting abstained.—While we behold the ministers of the gospel of peace, beginning to present the gospel in this aspect to their people, and hear the followers of the Prince of Peace commencing to pray with this reference, we feel that our labors have not been wholly in vain.

Have we not reason to believe, that if every church would observe the concert of prayer for the abolition of war, the predicted GLORY of the latter days, i.e. of undefiled and true religion, of felt and practised Christianity, would shortly, or even immediately, appear? Would it be possible for despots to wage war, while the better part, nay, the best part of their subjects were praying to God for peace? In our own happy country, never can a civil war be lighted up while the churches and the men trusting in God are giving themselves to prayer; for so surely as war checks religion, so surely does prayer extinguish war. In such an age as this, prayer and war cannot exist together; either praying will make Christians cease fighting, or fighting will make them cease praying.

Should views of this sort, brief and plain as they are, be presented properly to all the churches in this country and throughout Christendom, would there not be ground to hope—and if they should, in addition, be received properly, would there not be cause to believe that war would never occur again among men bearing the Christian name? But, alas! who will go for us? whence are to come the means of sending them? The men, it is believed, might be found, if support for them could be obtained—and true it is, that if the churches in this land should, of their ability, give but a single dollar each, support for

them *would* be obtained. Surely, the most skeptical must admit, that the cause, and the immense interest at stake, are worthy of this cheap experiment.

But a stale and stereotyped objection rebuts our statements, and our plea—"Christian nations are now, generally, at peace." We acknowledge the fact with gratitude to Heaven—our principles begin to have influence even in the cabinets of kings. But what means that vast armament in Europe, and what this great military system in our own land? Very far is the reform from being complete. Men have only *commenced* seeing war as it is, all hung about with, and made up of, delusion, and folly, and sin. They are only *just becoming* sober from the deep intoxication of military glory. And now, who that has had any experience in curing the intemperate, leaves his patient just as he has commenced becoming sober—warning him against the baneful evils of intoxication, only when he *is* intoxicated? But there are many who oppose war only when war is raging; when the state is intoxicated with the stimulus of victory, or stung to madness with the goadings of defeat. Such persons consider not that *the time of peace is the season for making preparation against war*—if haply they do not applaud the other maxim, "*In* peace prepare for war," in our view one of the most specious, yet egregious falsities, that have ever deluded the world. Should there again occur to our nation a foreign or domestic war, thousands of souls would be lost. Can these, or any who disregard our cause, as they meet them at the bar of God, say, "True; you are lost for ever, and we offered not a prayer, nor gave a cent to *prevent* your everlasting ruin?"

But we are cheered by better hopes, though we thus speak. We have shown that the schoolroom, the study, the pulpit, and the press have given us something of that aid which, sufficiently increased, will enable us, so far as means have any power, to accomplish the end we propose. When, generally, parents and guardians commend those writings which breathe a thoroughly Christian spirit, and fathers and mothers imbue their children's minds with the scriptural sentiments regarding war—then shall the murderous demon be arraigned at the bar of the gospel—piety and philanthropy shall convict him of slaughtering thirty-five thousand millions of beings made in the image of God, of men enough to fill seventy earths like this—and though interest, and pride, and custom plead in his behalf, rectitude shall pass sentence on him, and public sentiment shall haste to execute it, and hurry him out of the world.

APPENDIX V

Non-Resistance Society: Declaration of Principles, 1838

Assembled in Convention from various sections of the American Union, for the promotion of peace on earth, and good will among men, we, the undersigned, regard it as due to ourselves, to the cause which we love, to the country in which we live, and to the world, to publish a DECLARATION, expressive of the principles we cherish, the purpose we aim to accomplish, and the measures we shall adopt to carry forward the work of peaceful, universal reformation.

We cannot acknowledge allegiance to any human government; neither can we oppose any such government by a resort to physical force. We recognize but one KING and LAWGIVER, one JUDGE and RULER of mankind. We are bound by the laws of a kingdom which is not of this world; the subjects of which are forbidden to fight; in which MERCY and TRUTH are met together, and RIGHTEOUSNESS and PEACE have kissed each other; which has no state lines, no national partitions, no geographical boundaries; in which there is no distinction of rank, or division of caste, or inequality of sex; the officers of which are PEACE, its exactors RIGHTEOUSNESS, its walls SALVATION, and its gates PRAISE; and which is destined to break in pieces and consume all other kingdoms.

Our country is the world, our countrymen are all mankind. We love the land of our nativity only as we love all other lands. The interests, rights, liberties of American citizens are no more dear to us, than are those of the whole human race. Hence, we can allow no appeal to patriotism, to revenge any national insult or injury. The PRINCE OF PEACE, under whose stainless banner we rally, came not to destroy, but to save, even the worst of enemies. He has left us an example, that we should follow his steps. GOD COMMANDETH HIS LOVE TOWARD US, IN THAT, WHILE WE WERE YET SINNERS, CHRIST DIED FOR US.

We conceive, that if a nation has no right to defend itself against foreign enemies, or to punish its invaders, no individual possesses that right in his own case. The unit cannot be of greater importance than the aggregate. If one man may take life, to obtain or defend his rights, the same license must necessarily be granted to communities, states, and nations. If *he* may use a dagger or a pistol, *they* may employ cannon, bomb-shells, land and naval forces. The means of self-preservation must be in proportion to the magnitude of interests at stake, and the number of lives exposed to destruction. But if a rapacious and blood-thirsty soldiery, thronging these shores from

abroad, with intent to commit rapine and destroy life, may not be resisted by the people or magistracy, then ought no resistance to be offered to domestic troublers of the public peace, or of private security. No obligations can rest upon Americans to regard foreigners as more sacred in their persons than themselves, or to give them a monopoly of wrong-doing with impunity.

The dogma, that all the governments of the world are approvingly ordained of God, and that THE POWERS THAT BE in the United States, in Russia, in Turkey, are in accordance with his will, is not less absurd than impious. It makes the impartial Author of human freedom and equality, unequal and tyrannical. It cannot be affirmed, that THE POWERS THAT BE, in any nation, are actuated by the spirit, or guided by the example of Christ, in the treatment of enemies; therefore, they cannot be agreeable to the will of God; and, therefore, their overthrow, by a spiritual regeneration of their subjects, is inevitable.

We register our testimony, not only against all wars, whether offensive or defensive, but all preparations for war; against every naval ship, every arsenal, every fortification; against the militia system and a standing army; against all military chieftains and soldiers; against all monuments commemorative of victory over a foreign foe, all trophies won in battle, all celebrations in honor of military or naval exploits; against all appropriations for the defence of a nation by force and arms, on the part of any legislative body; against every edict of government requiring of its subjects military service. Hence, we deem it unlawful to bear arms, or to hold a military office.

As every human government is upheld by physical strength, and its laws are enforced virtually at the point of the bayonet, we cannot hold any office which imposes upon its incumbent the obligation to compel men to do right, on pain of imprisonment or death. We therefore voluntarily exclude ourselves from every legislative and judicial body, and repudiate all human politics, worldly honors, and stations of authority. If *we* cannot occupy a seat in the legislature, or on the bench, neither can we elect *others* to act as our substitutes in any such capacity.

It follows, that we cannot sue any man at law to compel him by force to restore anything which he may have wrongfully taken from us or others; but, if he had seized our coat, we shall surrender up our cloak rather than subject him to punishment.

We believe that the penal code of the old covenant, AN EYE FOR AN EYE AND A TOOTH FOR A TOOTH, has been abrogated by JESUS CHRIST; and that under the new covenant, the forgiveness instead of the punishment of enemies has been enjoined upon all his disciples, in all cases whatsoever. To extort money from enemies, or set them upon a pillory, or cast them into prison, or hang them upon a gallows, is obviously not to forgive, but to take retribution. VENGEANCE IS MINE—I WILL REPAY, SAITH THE LORD.

The history of mankind is crowded with evidence, proving that physical coercion is not adapted to moral regeneration; that the sinful dispositions of man can be subdued only by love; that evil can be

exterminated from the earth only by goodness; that it is not safe to rely upon an arm of flesh, upon man whose breath is in his nostrils, to preserve us from harm; that there is great security in being gentle, harmless, long-suffering, and abundant in mercy; that it is only the meek who shall inherit the earth, for the violent who resort to the sword are destined to perish with the sword. Hence, as a measure of sound policy,—of safety to property, life and liberty,—of public quietude and private enjoyment,—as well as on the ground of allegiance to HIM who is KING OF KINGS, and LORD OF LORDS,—we cordially adopt the non-resistance principle; being confident that it provides for all possible consequences, will insure all things needful to us, is armed with omnipotent power, and must ultimately triumph over every assailing force.

We advocate no Jacobinical doctrines. The spirit of Jacobinism is the spirit of retaliation, violence, and murder. It neither fears God, nor regards man. *We* would be filled with the spirit of CHRIST. If we abide by our principles, it is impossible for us to be disorderly, or plot treason, or participate in any evil work; we shall submit to every ordinance of man, FOR THE LORD'S SAKE; obey all the requirements of government, except such as we deem contrary to the commands of the gospel; and in no case resist the operation of law, except by meekly submitting to the penalty of disobedience.

But, while we shall adhere to the doctrine of non-resistance and passive submission to enemies, we purpose, in a moral and spiritual sense, to speak and act boldly in the cause of GOD; to assail iniquity in high places, and in low places; to apply our principles to all existing civil, political, legal and ecclesiastical institutions; and to hasten the time, when the kingdoms of this world will have become the kingdoms of our LORD and of his CHRIST, and he shall reign forever.

It appears to us a self-evident truth, that whatever the gospel is designed to destroy at any period of the world, being contrary to it, ought now to be abandoned. If, then, the time is predicted, when swords shall be beaten into ploughshares, and spears into pruning hooks, and men shall not learn the art of war any more, it follows that all who manufacture, sell, or wield those deadly weapons, do thus array themselves against the peaceful dominion of the SON OF GOD on earth.

Having thus briefly, but frankly, stated our principles and purposes, we proceed to specify the measures we propose to adopt, in carrying our object into effect.

We expect to prevail, through THE FOOLISHNESS OF PREACHING—striving to commend ourselves unto every man's conscience, in the sight of GOD. From the press, we shall promulgate our sentiments as widely as practicable. We shall endeavor to secure the coöperation of all persons, of whatever name or sect. The triumphant progress of the cause of TEMPERANCE and of ABOLITION in our land, through the instrumentality of benevolent and voluntary associations, encourages us to combine our own means and efforts for the promotion

of a still greater cause. Hence, we shall employ lecturers, circulate tracts and publications, form societies, and petition our state and national governments, in relation to the subject of UNIVERSAL PEACE. It will be our leading object to devise ways and means for effecting a radical change in the views, feelings and practices of society, respecting the sinfulness of war and the treatment of enemies.

In entering upon the great work before us, we are not unmindful that, in its prosecution, we may be called to test our sincerity, even as in a fiery ordeal. It may subject us to insult, outrage, suffering, yea, even death itself. We anticipate no small amount of misconception, misrepresentation, calumny. Tumults may arise against us. The ungodly and violent, the proud and pharisaical, the ambitious and tyrannical, principalities and powers, and spiritual wickedness in high places, may combine to crush us. So they treated the MESSIAH, whose example we are humbly striving to imitate. If we suffer with him, we know that we shall reign with him. We shall not be afraid of their terror, neither be troubled. Our confidence is in the LORD ALMIGHTY, not in man.

Having withdrawn from human protection, what can sustain us but that faith which overcomes the world? We shall not think it strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try us, as though some strange thing had happened unto us; but rejoice, inasmuch as we are partakers of CHRIST'S sufferings. Wherefore, we commit the keeping of our souls to GOD, in well-doing, as unto a faithful Creator. FOR EVERY ONE THAT FORSAKES HOUSES, OR BRETHREN, OR SISTERS, OR FATHER, OR MOTHER, OR WIFE, OR CHILDREN, OR LANDS, FOR CHRIST'S SAKE, SHALL RECEIVE A HUNDREDFOLD, AND SHALL INHERIT EVERLASTING LIFE.

Firmly relying upon the certain and universal triumph of the sentiments contained in this DECLARATION, however formidable may be the opposition arrayed against them—in solemn testimony of our faith in their divine origin,—we hereby affix our signatures to it; commending it to the reason and conscience of mankind, giving ourselves no anxiety as to what may befall us, and resolving, in the strength of the LORD GOD, calmly and meekly to abide the issue.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

The seeker after more than general facts will have no easy task. There are fragments of information obtainable from certain individuals and some of the peace societies. The New York Public Library, the Boston Public Library, the Congressional Library at Washington, the libraries of historical associations, contain an abundance of material; small city libraries of New England will be found useful, especially those located nearest to the particular writer whose work is wanted.

But the libraries and the peace societies cannot supply the thorough inquirer with all the necessary matter. Many facts here unearthed are from obscure source material obtained by searching interminably through old book stores, by visit and laborious correspondence, and even by importing certain rare items from abroad.

Besides references to most of the significant books, periodicals, tracts, published speeches, or pamphlets of the early peace movement in this country, other sources used have been literally hundreds of minor writings and a few unpublished manuscripts, notations, and marginalia preserved through lucky accidents of fate.

Since the manuscript of the present volume was completed, there has appeared, published by the Duke University Press, a most excellent historical study entitled *The American Peace Crusade,* by Professor Merle Eugene Curti. While it covers only the period from 1815 to 1860, an additional study is contemplated. Especially valuable is Professor Curti's work for its integration of the European and American peace societies of the early years.

I desire to acknowledge here the courtesy of Miss Arabella Carter, for many years Secretary of the Universal Peace Union and the Pennsylvania Peace Society, in supplying me with valuable references and information from her intimate historic knowledge; the critical historical aid of Mr. H. C. Engelbrecht, of the editorial staff of *Social Science Abstracts;* and others who have patiently steered me with their wisdom—in libraries, in book stores, and in gentle or caustic discussions.

CHAPTER I

1. *The Advocate of Peace,* June, 1828. 2. See, in part, *The Quakers in Peace and War,* by Margaret Hirst, pp. 243ff., Doran, 1923. 3. Edwin Ginn, Edwin D. Mead, Arthur Deerin Call, *et al.* 4. Julius Moritzen, in *The American Peace Movement,* Putnam, 1912. 5. *The Friend of Peace,*

Vol. I, No. 10, p. 34. 6. See Edwin D. Mead's introduction to the reprint of David Low Dodge's two pamphlets, published, 1905, by Ginn; and *The Will to End War,* by Arthur Deerin Call, reprinted from *The Advocate of Peace* for April and May, 1924; also *Memorial of Mr. David L. Dodge* (especially Dodge's autobiography, contained therein, 1854. 7. *The Friend of Peace,* Vol. I, No. 10, p. 35. 8. *The Herald of Peace,* Lemoore, California, October, 1927.

CHAPTER II

1. *The Manual of Peace.* 2. See *The Book of Peace,* American Peace Society, 1845. 3. *The History of the Rise, Increase and Progress of The Christian People Called Quakers, Intermixed with Several Remarkable Occurrences,* by William Sewel, edition of 1844, p. 58. 4. *The Christian Century,* February 17, 1927. 5. *The Daily Remembrancer,* by John Hemmenway, 1875. 6. *The Manual of Peace,* p. 70. 7. The author, in an undergraduate independent paper, *The Rational Patriot,* April 18, 1917. 8. *The Christian Century,* January 27, 1927.

CHAPTER III

1. *Essays of Philanthropos,* first published in *The Christian Mirror.* 2. *The Friend of Peace,* Vol. I, No. 2. 3. Same, Vol. I, No. 4. 4. From a series of translations published by the University of Pennsylvania. 5. *The Pilgrims' First Year in New England,* by the Reverend Nahum Gale, 1857. 6. *The Friend of Peace,* January, 1821. 7. *The First Americans,* by Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker, Macmillan, 1927. 8. *The Calumet,* November-December, 1831. 9. *The Warfare between Science and Theology,* by Andrew D. White; also *The Friend of Peace,* February, 1819, Vol. II, No. 3. (On account of republication as pamphlets, the dating of numerous early issues contains duplications and confusing errors.) 10. *The Advocate of Peace,* December, 1840. 11. *A Discourse on the Evils and the End of War.* 12. Published as an address without title, as of December 25, 1817. 13. *The Harbinger of Peace,* July, 1828. 14. *The Harbinger of Peace,* November, 1828. 15. Address before the Hartford County Peace Society, June 10, 1832. 16. *An Address on the Truth, Dignity, Power and Beauty of the Principles of Peace and on the Unchristian Character and Influence of War and the Warrior,* May 6, 1832. 17. *The Calumet,* November-December, 1834. 18. *Orations on Intemperance, War, and the Atonement,* 1844. 19. *The Bond of Brotherhood,* June, 1849. 20. Same. 21. *The Church and the Rebellion,* by R. L. Stanton, D.D., 1864. 22. *The Advocate of Peace,* May-June, 1861; letter from the Reverend Titus Coan, dated January 16, 1861. 23. *The Growth of Peace Principles and the Methods of Propagating Them.* 24. *War from the Christian Point of View,* published by the American Peace Society. 25. *The Peacemaker and Court of Arbitration,* August, 1901. 26. Reprinted in *The Messenger of Peace,* April, 1927. 27. The newspapers and periodicals of the period abound with sentiments such as these, which were given wide circulation at the time in numerous journals. A survey of this literature shows that these few quotations, instead of giving a heightened impression, fail to convey adequately the general clerical ferocity of the period. 28. The foregoing quotations are taken directly from the literature of the organizations referred to. 29. *World Peace* (India), August 30, 1923. 30. In my own hearing.

CHAPTER IV

1. *Night Thoughts,* by Edward Young, 1681-1765. 2. *The Friend of Peace,* December, 1818. 3. Pennsbury Leaflet, *For My Part I Will Not Go to War.* 4. *The Friend of Peace,* February, 1820. 5. The files of *The Friend of Peace, The Harbinger of Peace, The Calumet, The American Advocate of Peace, The Advocate of Peace, The Bond of Brotherhood, The Christian Citizen,* etc., contain numerous resolutions of this general character. They are so common that references will not be given for each one cited here. In the order given, the periodicals above named constitute the leading peace journals circulated in the United States from 1815 to the Civil War. Each of the first five grew out of the one immediately before it, though occasionally two existed simultaneously for a short time. *The Bond of Brotherhood,* edited by Elihu Burritt, though published in England, was sent out extensively here; Burritt's *Christian Citizen* was published at Worcester, Mass., under the guiding hand of Thomas Drew while Burritt was abroad. 6. *The Calumet,* November-December, 1832. 7. Letter to the Church Peace Union Committee on Reduction of Armaments, March 27, 1921.

CHAPTER V

1. *Disarmament and World Peace,* published 1926 by the National Council for Prevention of War. 2. Before the Foreign Policy Association, April 2, 1923. 3. *War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ.* 4. *The Book of Peace,* a collection of tracts published by the American Peace Society in 1845. 5. *The Calumet,* March-April, 1834. 6. Same. 7. *The Calumet,* January-February, 1835. 8. *The Manual of Peace,* p. 171. 9. *War and Peace, the Evils of the First and a Plan for Preserving the Last,* American Peace Society, 1842. Reprinted in 1919 by the Oxford University Press, American Branch, with an introduction by James Brown Scott. 10. December 14, 1872. 11. *New Wars for Old,* 1916, p. 46. 12. *Our Military Policy,* Society of American Military Engineers. 13. *A Digest of International Law,* 1906, Vol. VII, p. 153. 14. *Columbia University Quarterly,* June, 1916. 15. Some outstanding demilitarized zones besides those mentioned in the context are the Straits of Magellan, an area ten miles in length along the Burmese-Tibetan frontier, the coast of Morocco across from Gibraltar, a frontier area between Norway and Sweden, Spitzbergen, a stretch fifty kilometers east of the Rhine, the Saar Valley, a strip thirty kilometers deep between Turkey and Bulgaria and similarly between Turkey and Greece. 16. *The Lawless Law of Nations,* by Sterling E. Edmunds, 1925, p. 187. 17. Before the Conference on the Cause and Cure of War, Washington, December, 1926. 18. *The World Tomorrow,* December, 1927. 19. Letter of Theodore Marburg to the *New York Times,* August 4, 1927. 20. *E.g.,* the *New York Telegram,* November 8, 1927. 21. For an adequate treatment of this subject, see *The World Tomorrow* for April, 1925. 22. *New York Times,* September 2, 1927. 23. Quoted, from press reports, in *The World Tomorrow,* November, 1927. 24. Issue of July-August, 1834. 25. For a valuable recognition of the realities that pacifists must face, see *A Critique of Pacifism,* by Reinhold Niebuhr, in *The Atlantic Monthly,* May, 1927. 26. *Manual of Citizenship Training,* by C. P. Futcher in collaboration with the American Citizenship Foundation. This is a classic of reactionary politics and militarist doctrine, which is used in the War Department's work with what it estimates as 260,000 of our young men annually.

CHAPTER VI

1. No really adequate summary of these early peace plans has come to my notice. Anyone not desiring to explore the originals can piece together an incomplete record from the following references: an article by Alfred Fried, the famous German pacifist, in *Current History* for March, 1917; William Ladd's *Prize Essays on a Congress of Nations,* published in 1840 and available in the larger libraries; and a *Synopsis of Plans for International Organization* by the late Charles H. Livermore, published by the American Peace Society in 1919. The article by Dr. Fried is reprinted in *War—Cause and Cure,* a handbook compiled by Julia E. Johnsen and published, 1926, by the H. W. Wilson Co. Edwin D. Mead's *The Great Design of Henry IV,* published by Ginn in 1909 and available from the World Peace Foundation, will be found of value. See also W. Evans Darby's *International Tribunals.* 2. Penn's *Essay* is available in the *Everyman Library* edition. 3. *Prize Essays on a Congress of Nations;* also see *The Book of Peace,* American Peace Society, 1845. 4. *The Calumet,* November-December, 1832. 5. *The American People,* by Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker, Scribner's, 1926, p. 255. 6. One of the best accounts of the steps taken by the League, presented with scholarly detail and impartiality, is *State Security and the League of Nations,* by Bruce Williams, Johns Hopkins Press, 1927. See also Vol. VI, No. 11, Aug. 6, 1930 issue of the Foreign Policy Association's Information Service, by Mildred S. Wertheimer, entitled *The League of Nations and Prevention of War.* 7. Bulletin of March 30, 1928, Vol. IV, No. 2. 8. *The Confederation of Europe,* by Walter Alison Phillips, Longmans, Green, 1914, pp. 297-8. 9. See *Post-War Treaties of Security and Mutual Guarantee,* by Norman L. Hill, November, 1928, issue of *International Conciliation.*

CHAPTER VII

1. *The Friend of Peace,* Vol. I, No. 4, contains the gist of this table. 2. *Armaments and Arbitration,* by A. T. Mahan, 1912. 3. *Essays on Religion,* by A. Clutton-Brock, 1926. 4. See Mahan, above. 5. The information introduced above on the early history of arbitration is woven together from many scattered sources, the principal ones of which are (*a*) the proceedings of the 1896 American Conference on International Arbitration, accompanied by a long article on the subject prepared for the Conference by Dr. John Bassett Moore, who acknowledges his own debt to a work entitled *Traite Theorique et Pratique de l'Arbitrage International,* by M. A. Merignhac, Professor of International Law at Toulouse; and (*b*) an essay on *Internationalism* by Don Arturo de Marcoartu, 1876. 6. William Ladd: *Prize Essays on a Congress of Nations.* 7. *The Book of Peace.* 8. *War and Peace,* by William Jay. 9. There can be no doubt that the peace movement, in claiming the insertion of Article 21 as a result of its activity for arbitration, was wrong. See a paper on this point by Professor M. E. Curti in *The American Historical Review* for April, 1928. 10. *Arbitration and the United States,* published by the World Peace Foundation, 1926. For the essential facts this is an invaluable outline. For details, and especially for the views of the peace societies and the public, the peace journals and files of newspapers should be consulted. 11. *The Peacemaker and Court of Arbitration,* May, 1904. 12. *A History of Presidential Elections,* by Edward Stanwood, 1884. 13. *Arbitration and the United States,* above. 14. *The*

Rise of American Civilization, Vol. II, p. 535, Macmillan, 1927. 15. *Mohonk Addresses,* Ginn, 1910, p. 111. 16. See *Arbitration and the United States,* above, and with it *American Arbitration Agreements Today,* by Denys P. Myers, World Peace Foundation, 1928. 17. See, especially, *Banishing War Through Arbitration,* by Noel H. Field. National Council for Prevention of War, 1926. 18. See *An Analysis of the Arbitrations to Which the United States Has Been a Party,* published by The American Foundation, 1927.

CHAPTER VIII

1. As quoted by Mr. Raymond Grant in a radio debate with Lucia Ames Mead, at Boston, October, 1925; printed in the Boston *Herald* and as a pamphlet by the National Council for Prevention of War, 1926. 2. In a speech reported by the New York *Times* of October 11, 1926. 3. *Man Is War,* by John Carter, Bobbs Merrill, 1926. 4. See *War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ.* 5. *The Evils of War, and When Only It Is Lawful to Go to War,* a sermon preached at Steuben, N. Y., April, 1913, by the Reverend Benjamin Bell, A.M., printed at Sangerfield, N. Y., March, 1814. 6. *A Discourse on the Evils and the End of War.* 7. *The Friend of Peace,* February 1, 1818. 8. Address to Massachusetts Peace Society, December 25, 1817. 9. *The Harbinger of Peace,* December, 1828. 10. Mr. Henry was Junior Pastor of the West Church in Hartford. This address, delivered on December 25, 1834, was printed as a *Discourse Pronounced before the Windham County Peace Society.* 11. See above, same author. 12. First published as a series of articles in *The Nineteenth Century,* 1890-96. As a book first issued in England, 1902; published in the United States, 1916, by Alfred A. Knopf. 13. Putnam's, 1916. 14. Sermon of July 30, 1870, as printed in *The Plymouth Pulpit.* 15. See *Is War Civilization?,* by Christophe Nyrop, p. 18, Dodd, Mead, 1917. 16. *Social Organization,* by Charles H. Cooley, p. 28ff., Scribner's, 1913. 17. *Human Nature and Conduct,* by John Dewey, p. 107, Holt, 1922. 18. *Human Nature and Its Remaking,* by W. E. Hocking, p 2ff., Yale University Press, 1918. 19. By Charles Francis Lawson, Appleton, 1924. 20. Abram Lipsky. 21. See Appendix I, *Prize Essays on a Congress of Nations.* 22. See a paper read by Nathan Goold before the Maine Historical Society, October 27, 1898, in Collections and Proceedings, Second Series, Vol. X, pub.; Portland, Maine., 1899, p. 52ff. 23. *Memories of Two Wars,* by Gen. Frederick Funston, p. 149. 24. See *Shall It Be Again?,* by John Kenneth Turner, p. 12, Huebsch, 1922. 25. Edmund J. James, former president of the University of Illinois in his introduction to Harrison S. Kerrick's *Military and Naval America,* Doubleday, Page, 1916. 26. *A Private in the Guards,* by Stephen Graham, p. 95, Macmillan, 1919.

CHAPTER IX

1. *Letters to Caleb Strong,* etc. 2. Printed as a pamphlet by the Society. 3. From *Navigation and Commerce,* McCulloch's reprint, London, 1774, p. 41; quoted by Professor R. M. Johnson, in *The Infantry Journal,* November-December, 1914. 4. See Upham's *Manual of Peace,* p. 47. 5. Address to American Peace Society, May 26, 1845. 6. *An Inquiry into the Accordancy of War with the Principles of Christianity.* 7. *The Harbinger of Peace,* April, 1829. 8. President Wilson's address of September 5, 1919. 9. *Why Wars Come,* p. 6. 10. *The Challenge of War—An Economic Inter-*

pretation (pamphlet), by Norman Thomas. League for Industrial Democracy, 1923. 11. *Century Magazine,* May, 1924. 12. *What Is National Honor?* by Leo Perla, p. 19, Macmillan, 1918. 13. Granville Hicks, in *The Congregationalist,* November 4, 1926. 14. See *A History of Economic Progress in the United States,* by Walter W. Jennings, p. 295. Crowell, 1926. 15. Frances Wright, in *The Free Enquirer,* November 27, 1830. Quoted in Jennings, p. 296. 16. Stratford, *History of English Patriotism,* p. 591. 17. Letter to first anniversary conference of the Universal Peace Union, 1867. 18. See *Garrison the Non-Resistant,* by Ernest Howard Crosby. 19. Report for 1884-85 of the National Arbitration League, by Dr. R. McMurdy. 20. See address of the Reverend C. S. Henry, above. 21. Reprinted by the New York *Telegram, October* 5, 1927, from *The Illinois Miner.* 22. *The Peacemaker,* April, 1902. 23. *The Peacemaker,* for May and for June, 1903. 24. Same, May, 1903.

CHAPTER X

1. See reference to Bell's sermon, above. 2. Joseph Fawcett, who wrote *The Art of War,* 1795, and *War Elegies,* 1802. 3. *The Friend of Peace,* Vol. II, No. 5, August, 1819. 4. Address on *The Nature and Influence of War,* delivered before the American Peace Society at Boston, May 29, 1843. 5. *The Bond of Brotherhood,* April, 1847. 6. *Dollars and World Peace,* Doran, 1927. 7. *The Rise of the Common Man, 1830-50,* p. 161, by Carl Russell Fish. Macmillan, 1927. 8. *The Friend of Peace,* Vol. IV, No. 4, p. 138 (1825). 9. July-August. 10. *Janus, the Conquest of War,* p. 122. 11. *The Outlawry of War,* p. 209. 12. Speech at the Cooper Institute, New York City, September 10, 1863.

CHAPTER XI

1. New York *Tribune,* as reprinted by *The World Tomorrow,* January, 1924. 2. *The Friend of Peace,* May, 1818. 3. *Letters to Caleb Strong,* above. 4. *The Calumet,* March-April, 1834. 5. Figures in 1827 report. 6. *Industrial Preparedness,* by C. E. Knoppel, 1916, p. 18. 7. Letter of Dr. Abraham Flexner to the New York *World,* February 7, 1928. Also see a similar letter in the New York *Times, December* 25, 1927. 8. Letter of Lydia G. Wentworth to the New York *World,* December 22, 1925. 9. Professor J. E. Morrison, Queen's University, Kingston, Canada; quoted in *Symposium on War,* compiled by John Horsch. 10. *Symposium on War,* above. 11. In *War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ.* 12. *A Solemn Review of the Custom of War.* 13. *The Friend of Peace,* February, 1820. 14. Reverend Reuen Thomas, D.D., in *The War System, Its History, Tendency, and Character, in the Light of Civilization and Religion,* published by the American Peace Society, 1896. 15. *Harper's Magazine,* March, 1918. 16. *How We Advertised America,* by George Creel. 17. H. C. Engelbrecht, in *The World Tomorrow,* April, 1927. 18. *Falsehood in War-Time,* p. 25, published in London by Allen and Unwin, 1928, and in the United States by Dutton, 1929. 19. *The American Legion Monthly,* July, 1927. 20. Sherwood Eddy, December 25, 1924, quoted in *Symposium on War.* 21. *War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ.* 22. *An Inquiry into the Accordancy of War,* etc. 23. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. 24. Dr. Frederick Lynch, quoted by *The Herald of Peace,* May, 1928. 25. New York *World,* June 1, 1928. 26. The

Lawless Law of Nations, by Sterling E. Edmunds, p. 385. 27. *Bismarck—Some Secret Pages of His History,* by Julius Herman Moritz Busch, Vol. I, p. 128. 28. Quoted by Mary Kelsey, in *The Messenger of Peace,* April, 1927.

CHAPTER XII

1. See Benjamin Bell, above. 2. Address at Center Church, Hartford, Conn., June 10, 1832. 3. See his *Internationalism,* above. 4. New York *World,* February 27, 1928. 5. I am well aware of the fact that this statement will be challenged. Professor Carlton J. H. Hayes, for example, has written an excellent work, *Essays on Nationalism,* in which he differentiates sharply between patriotism, which has always existed, and nationalism, which is a new development. However, I am not persuaded of such a great difference; for the nationalism to which he attributes so many evils appears in the final analysis to be only a more blatant, more powerful emotion, because based on more substantial entities. Psychologically I believe the emotion to be the same; the ancient Israelites were stirred by the same essential passion as that which moves Mussolini's Facisti. The difference may be quantitative; qualitatively different I do not think it is; and call the emotion what you will, its dilution is the one sound answer. If Professor Hayes' type of nationalism were removed by a magic scepter overnight, and his patriotism left, the same thing would have been accomplished as if patriotism were weakened by an internationalization of loyalty and devotion. It is by loving one's country passionately (patriotism) that one fails to consider the point of view of other countries (nationalism). 6. Quoted by Ernest Howard Crosby in his address to the Pennsylvania Peace Society, December 3, 1901. 7. The phrase is from Viscomte de Vogue, and was often quoted by the late Eugene V. Debs. 8. *The Calumet,* March-April, 1834. 9. *Grosse Politik* (reprints, etc., from German archives), Vol. 19, part 2, p. 536. 10. *Grosse Politik,* Vol. 19, part 2, Document No. 6266, September 27, 1904. 11. Personal correspondence with Lord Ponsonby. 12. Editorial in *Metropolitan Magazine,* December, 1919. 13. New York *Tribune,* December 15, 1919. 14. *Playing at Peace,* a pamphlet issued by the (British) National Council for Prevention of War, reprinted from the Sunday *Express* and the New York *Times.* 15. See letter signed Virginius Dabney, in *The Nation,* March 7, 1928. 16. *The American Peace Society, a Centennial History,* by Edson L. Whitney. 17. Quoted in *Pax International,* July, 1928, bulletin of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. 18. Article, A Department of Peace, in *The Christian Leader,* October 13, 1928. 19. *The New Republic,* April 7, 1917, p. 279. 20. Almost the last utterance of Woodrow Wilson on public affairs, spoken to Mr. James Kerney, and printed in *The Saturday Evening Post.* 21. *The Friend of Peace,* October, 1820. 22. Thomas S. Grimké, *Address on the Truth, Dignity, Power and Beauty of the Principles of Peace,* etc., etc., at New Haven, Conn., May 6 1832.

CHAPTER XIII

1. *The Friend of Peace,* 1825, Vol. IV, No. IV. 2. *Recollections of Our Anti-Slavery Conflict,* by Samuel J. May. 3. *William Lloyd Garrison,* by his children (4 vols.), 1885, Vol. II, p. 226. 4. *The Women of the Revolution,* by Elizabeth F. Ellet, Philadelphia, 1900. 5. *My Story of the War,* by Mary A. Livermore, 1887. 6. *Our Women in the War,* an address by

Captain Francis W. Dawson, February 22, 1887, at the Fifth Annual Reunion of the Association of the Maryland Line, Baltimore. 7. Same as note 5 above. 8. *Julia Ward Howe,* by Laura E. Richards and Maud Howe Elliott, Houghton Mifflin, 1925. 9. *The Advocate of Peace,* February, 1871. 10. *The Mission of the United States in the Cause of Peace,* address by Honorable David J. Brewer of the U. S. Supreme Court, before the New Jersey State Bar Association, June 12, 1909. 11. See printed proceedings. 12. *American Women and the World War,* by Ida Clyde Clark. Appleton, 1918. 13. Same. 14. Same. 15. For the text of the amendment and for the record of the hearing on it before a Senate sub-committee—a valuable textbook of peace—see *Hearing before a Sub-committee of the Committee on the Judiciary* United States Senate, Seventy-first Congress, Second Session, on S. J. Res. 45, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States Relative to War. April 12, 1930.

CHAPTER XIV

1. *The Pilgrims' First Year in New England,* by Reverend Nahum Gale, 1857. 2. *The Art of War in Europe,* by Colonel R. Delafield, 1861. 3. New York *Telegram,* October 21, 1927. 4. *Instructions for Field Artillery,* by Capts. Wm. H. French, Wm. F. Barry, and H. J. Hunt, 1864. 5. New York *Times,* March 29, 1928. 6. New York *Times,* March 25, 1928. 7. *The New Republic,* January 18, 1928. 8. New York *Telegram,* December 23, 1927. 9. *Armaments Year Book* for 1927-28, published by the League of Nations. 10. *Boy in the Wind,* by George Dillon, Viking Press, 1927. 11. New York *Times Magazine,* p. 21, June 10, 1928. 12. The number of lives lost due to the War, counting in the effects of blockade, etc., etc., reached a total of about 25,000,000. 13. New York *World,* November 14, 1924. 14. Quoted, from a newspaper report, by Wilbur K. Thomas in *The Friend,* Twelfth Month 17, 1925. 15. Report of the Secretary of War, 1927. 16. Benjamin Harrow, *The Romance of the Atom,* Boni and Liveright, 1927. 17. New York *Times,* June 11, 1928. 18. J. E. Mills, quoted in *The Literary Digest,* October 29, 1927. 19. Dispatch printed in the Norwalk, Conn., *Hour,* December 7, 1927. 20. *The Atlantic Monthly,* February, 1924. 21. Dispatch to New York *World,* April 16, 1928. 22. New York *Times,* January 18, 1928. 23. See the New York *World,* November 8, 1925. 24. *Pall Mall Magazine,* September, 1924. 25. New York *Times,* August 19, 1928. 26. See *Proceedings.* 27. *Peace or War?* by Lt.-Commander J. M. Kenworthy, Boni and Liveright, 1927. 28. *Liberty,* December 13, 1924. 29. *A Handbook for the General Staff,* 1924.

CHAPTER XV

1. Pointed out by John Bakeless, in his book, *The Origin of the Next War,* p. 258. Viking Press, 1926. 2. The information used regarding the draft in the Civil War is taken from scattered sources, the principal of which are *Our Military Policy,* by Lt.-Col. P.S. Bond, 1925, and *The Military and Naval History of the Rebellion in the United States,* by W. J. Tenney, 1866, chapter 33. Colonel Bond's pamphlet has been serviceable for reference regarding our other wars. 3. *Federal Council* (of Churches) *Bulletin,* July-August, 1925. 4. New York *Times,* June 11, 1928. 5. The figures used above are taken from the most authentic available pamphlet on the question of military training: *Militarizing Our Youth,* by Roswell

P. Barnes. Published by the Committee on Militarism in Education, Room 387, Bible House, New York City. 6. Hearing before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, on S. 750, January 26, 1928. 7. *Manual of Citizenship Training,* by C. P. Futcher, War Department, 1927. 8. New York *Times,* November 27, 1927, reprinting an article by Herbert E. Smith in the *United States Army Recruiting News.* 9. *U.S.R.A. Bulletin,* February, 1924. 10. For a description of these occurrences see a letter by Lucia Ames Mead in the New York *World,* December 24, 1924. 11. Annual report of Boy Scouts, 1926. 12. New York *Times,* November 21, 1926. 13. Washington, D. C., *Sunday Star,* April 15, 1928. 14. See *Militarism in America,* reprint of an address by Fanny Bixby Spencer at the Los Angeles Open Forum, June 6, 1926. 15. *The Book of Peace.* 16. *International Journal of Ethics,* April, 1928. 17. *A Handbook for the War Department General Staff,* 1924. 18. *Congressional Record,* February 27, 1928, pp. 3715 to 3723. 19. *McCall's Magazine,* November, 1927. 20. See *Unity,* June 18, 1928, or *National Council for Prevention of War News Bulletin* August 1, 1928. 21. New York *Times,* April 8, 1928. 22. Letter of August 30, 1922, made public in a memorandum for the press. 23. Dispatch from Louisville, Ky., to the New York *World,* August 22, 1924. 24. New York *Times,* July 10, 1927. 25. New York *Times,* April 17, 1927. 26. Percy MacKaye, in *The North American Review,* May, 1915. 27. New York *Telegram,* December 2, 1927.

CHAPTER XVI

1. *Memorial of Mr. David L. Dodge, Consisting of An Autobiography, Prepared at the Request and for the Use of His Children, with a Few Selections from His Writings,* by the Reverend Matson M. Smith, 1854. 2. Same. 3. *War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ.* 4. *The Friend of Peace,* Vol. I, No. 9. 5. *The Harbinger of Peace,* February, 1829. 6. Same. 7. Introduction to reprint of Dodge's essays, Ginn, 1905. 8. For general information on William Ladd, consult various 1927 and 1928 issues of *The Advocate of Peace; The American Peace Society,—A Centennial History,* by Edson L. Whitney, 1928; an article by Charles E. Beals in *The Granite Monthly,* September, 1912; a pamphlet, *William Ladd, the Apostle of Peace,* by George C. Wing, Jr., which is a reprint from *Sprague's Journal of Maine History;* an article, *Capt. William Ladd, the Apostle of Peace,* by John Witham Penney, in the *Collections of the Maine Historical Society,* second series, Vol. X; *The Apostle of Peace, Memoir of William Ladd,* by John Hemmenway, with an introduction by Elihu Burritt, published in 1872 by the American Peace Society (the most complete source, containing 272 pages); and an extremely valuable article and bibliography on Ladd and his works, in the *Maine Library Bulletin* for April, 1927. 9. *The Calumet,* March-April, 1833. 10. *The Calumet,* March-April, 1834. 11. This important work is not easy to find in libraries, and curiously enough is not mentioned by many writers on the Irish Rebellion or even by some Quakers writing on their own movement's history. Among these are Isabel Grubb's *Quakers in Ireland, 1654-1900,* Swarthmore Press, 1927. Hancock, of course, had drawn on one or two earlier reports. 12. *Address on the Truth, Dignity, Power and Beauty of the Principles of Peace,* etc., delivered at New Haven, Conn., May 6, 1832. 13. *The Calumet,* March-April, 1835. 14. *The American Advocate of Peace,* Hartford, Conn., December, 1836. 15. Reported in *The Calumet,* January-February, 1835.

CHAPTER XVII

1. *William Lloyd Garrison 1805-1879, the Story of His Life Told by His Children,* Vol. I, p. 113. 2. Same, Vol. II, p. 229. 3. Same, Vol. II, p. 227ff. For details of any sort regarding this entire period, Vol. II of this work is invaluable. For further matter, if desired, consult files of *The Liberator, The Non-Resistant,* and *The Advocate of Peace.* 4. *William Lloyd Garrison and His Times,* by Oliver Johnson, p. 284. 5. There is an extensive literature regarding Elihu Burritt, of which only the principal sources will be cited here. *The Life and Labors of Elihu Burritt,* by Charles Northend, brought out in 1879, is naturally the one which first suggests itself; but it is far from adequate. On page 478 of this memorial volume is a bibliography, almost complete, of Burritt's published works. Numerous periodicals of the time contain contributions from his stubby pen. The American Antiquarian Society at Worcester, Mass., is rich with Burrittana. Many popularizers wrote him up: he appears in *Crayon Sketches and Off-Hand Takings,* by George W. Bungay, 1852; *Our Great Benefactors,* by Samuel Adams Drake, 1888; and *Modern Agitators,* by David W. Bartlett, 1859. There is a fine Memoir of Burritt by Mary Howitt, the English writer (and also an autographed photograph) in Burritt's *Thoughts and Things at Home and Abroad,* 1854. Burritt's own autobiography will be found in his *Ten-Minute Talks on All Sorts of Topics,* 1874. An article which is interesting because of its illustrations but which conveys little of Burritt's radical pacifist vitality, written by Ellen Strong Bartlett, appeared in *The New England Magazine* for June, 1897. 6. See various references to "Sabbath," etc., in *Willliam Lloyd Garrison 1805-1879, the Story of His Life, Told by His Children.* 7. In Burritt's paper, *The Christian Citizen.* 8. *The Bond of Brotherhood,* September, 1846. 9. *The Advocate of Peace and Universal Brotherhood,* June, 1846.

CHAPTER XVIII

1. *The Life of Winfield Scott Hancock,* by Frederick E Goodrich, 1886, p. 50. 2. For the text and circumstances of this report, see *Report on the War with Mexico,* Old South Leaflet No. 132, published by the Old South Meeting House, Boston, Mass. 3. *The Advocate of Peace,* March-April, 1847. 4. Same, May-June, 1847. 5. *The Bond of Brotherhood,* September, 1847. 6. Same, June, 1849. 7. Same, December, 1847. 8. Same, November, 1846. 9. Article entitled "A Problem for Sentimental Young Ladies," in *The Bond of Brotherhood,* October, 1846. 10. For this and my other references to the peace movement and revolutionary Europe, I am indebted to an excellent article by Professor M. E. Curti in *The Advocate of Peace,* May, 1928, on *The Peace Movement and the Mid-Century Revolutions.* 11. *The First Americans,* by Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker, p. 233. 12. *Life and Labors of Elihu Burritt,* by Charles Northend, p. 150. 13. *The Peacemakers of 1864,* by Edward Chase Kirkland, Macmillan, 1927, p. 109. 14. *The Calumet,* March-April, 1833. 15. *The Peacemakers of 1864,* above, p. 6. 16. Same, p. 7. 17. Same, p. 10. 18. Same, p. 3. 19. *My Story of the War,* by Mary A. Livermore, p. 88. 20. J. Rodman Drake, in his poem "The Flag of Our Union." 21. These quotations are taken from an article on *Atrocity Charges in the Civil War,* by Laura A. White, in *The World Tomorrow,* for February, 1929. 22. For information on these draft riots see J. T. Headley's *Pen and Pencil Sketches of the Great Riots;* David

M. Barnes' *The Draft Riots in New York, July, 1863* (pamphlet); etc., etc. 23. *The Life and Letters of Edward Everett Hale,* by Edward E. Hale, Jr., 1917, Vol. I, p. 352ff. 24. Article on Ralph Waldo Emerson in the *Encyclopedia Britannica,* 13th Edition. 25. *John G. Whittier, Poet, Reformer, Mystic,* by Ernest E. Taylor, Friends' Tract Association, 1913. 26. *Lyrics of Loyalty,* edited by Frank Moore, 1864. 27. *The Military and Naval History of the Rebellion in the United States,* by W. J. Tenney, p. 201. 28. See reference 25 above, by Taylor. 29. Poem, "The Message of Peace," written for *The Sunday School Times.* 30. Poem, "Our Country's Call." 31. Poem, "Never or Now." 32. Poem, "The Cumberland." 33. See *Bugle Echoes,* edited by Francis F. Browne, 1886. 34. Same. 35. See the four-volume *Life* by his children, Vol. IV, p. 21. 36. *Recollections of Our Anti-Slavery Conflict,* by Samuel J. May, p. 352ff. 37. First quotation is from an address before the American Peace Society May 29, 1843; second from "Lessons of Our Late Rebellion," an address at the Society's annual meeting, May 19, 1867. 38. *The Quakers in Peace and War,* by Margaret E. Hirst, p. 424ff. 39. *The Fighting Quakers,* by A. J. H. Duganne, p. 112. 40. Not printed until *The Advocate of Peace* for May-June, 1861, came out. 41. *The Advocate of Peace,* July-August, 1861. 42. See his *Thoughts and Things at Home and Abroad.* 43. *The Advocate of Peace,* May-June, 1861. 44. Unfortunately Blanchard, who marked clearly most of his printed articles, did not do so in the case of the one quoted. It is not from *The Liberator, The Bond of Brotherhood,* or any of the papers to which he contributed most frequently, as the type-face proves by comparison. 45. *The Liberator,* September 27, 1861. 46. Boston *Courier,* April 11, 1863. 47. *Garrison, the Non-Resistant,* by Ernest Howard Crosby.

CHAPTER XIX

1. Rev. A. A. Miner, D.D., on his return from the 1889 Paris Peace Congress, at the Columbus Avenue Church, Boston, October 6, 1889. 2. Alfred H. Love to the Third American Peace Congress, Baltimore, 1911. 3. *Address of the Universal Peace Society to All Persons, Families, Communities and Nations,* 1866. 4. New York *World,* June 3, 1868. 5. For brief general information on Alfred H. Love nothing is better than the Memorial Number of *The Peacemaker* issued after his death by Arabella Carter. 6. *Unity,* September 8, 1913. 7. *The Will to End War,* a pamphlet by Arthur Deerin Call, American Peace Society, 1924. 8. Sermon of December 14, 1872. 9. Sermon of July 30, 1870. 10. Stanwood, *History of Presidential Elections.* 11. Same. 12. Address at Mystic, August 20, 1884. 13. *The Nation's Responsibility for Peace,* by Benjamin F. Trueblood, American Peace Society, 1895. 14. Address, "Our Educators, for Peace or War—Which?" by Ellen Goodell Smith, M.D., Mystic, Conn., August, 1895. 15. *The Peacemaker and Court of Arbitration,* October-November, 1895. 16. Same, May, 1903. 17. *The Advocate of Peace,* September, 1899. 18. *Proceedings,* p. 49. 19. *Life of William McKinley,* by C. S. Olcott, Vol. II, p. 109, Houghton, Mifflin. 20. *The Eclipse of Russia,* by E. J. Dillon, Doran, 1918, p. 269ff. 21. *The Advocate of Peace,* September, 1899. 22. "Song of Myself." 23. Address before the Peace and Arbitration League, March 22, 1910. 24. Cicero's *Philippica,* II, 15, 37. 25. In New York, June 30, 1916. 26. April 6, 1918. 27. See *The North American Student,* May, 1917. 28. *The Commoner,* September, 1917. 29. Before the New York Federation of Churches. 30. *The Santa Fé Magazine,* December, 1917. 31. See *A Manual of the Public Benefactions of Andrew Car-*

negie, 1919. 32. Major Sherman Miles, U.S.A., in *The North American Review,* March, 1923. 33. Quoted from *The Daily Herald,* London, by Horsch: *Symposium on War.* 34. Editorial in *The Christian Work,* November 5, 1921. 35. For example, see article by Lt.-Col. Leroy F. Smith in *National Republic,* November, 1927.

CHAPTER XX

1. *The Herald of Peace,* September, 1927. 2. *Janus, The Conquest of War,* p. 31.

CHAPTER XXI

1. See his *Letters to Caleb Strong,* etc., above. 2. *The Calumet,* November-December, 1834. 3. Reprinted from *The Herald of Peace* (England) in *The Calumet,* January-February, 1833. 4. A pamphlet on *Considerations Respecting the Lawfulness of War under the Gospel Dispensation,* etc., issued by the New York Yearly Meeting of Friends, First Month 4, 1848. 5. *History of European Morals,* by W. E. H. Lecky. 6. *The Calumet,* May-June, 1834. 7. *Selections from the Writings and Speeches of William Lloyd Garrison,* p. 88, Boston, 1852. 8. *The World Tomorrow,* April, 1925. 9. *Faith, War and Policy,* by Gilbert Murray, p. 25, Houghton, Mifflin. 10. Quoted in *Modern Martyrs,* a pamphlet issued by the War Resisters' International.

CHAPTER XXII

1. Judge Florence E. Allen, before the Conference on the Cause and Cure of War. *Congressional Record,* 1925. 2. Carrie Chapman Catt, before the American Academy of Political and Social Science, *Annals,* July, 1927. 3. James G. McDonald, before the American Academy of Political and Social Science, *Annals,* July, 1927. 4. *Connecticut Schools,* May, 1928. 5. *The Herald of Peace,* January, 1928. 6. *The North American Review,* May, 1915. 7. T. J. Edwards in *The Army Quarterly,* July, 1928. 8. *The World Tomorrow,* November, 1928. 9. *George Fox Digg'd Out of His Burrowes,* by Roger Williams, edited by Rev. J. Lewis Diman. Introduction. Published by the Narragansett Society. 10. Alfred Neave Brayshaw in *The Encyclopedia Britannica.* 11. *Principles and Acts in the Revolution in America,* by H. Niles, 1822, p. 334. 12. David Ferris, to the American Friends Peace Conference at Philadelphia, December 12-14, 1901. 13. A good account of the peace position of Friends in the War will be found in Margaret E. Hirst's *The Quakers in Peace and War.* 14. A. B. Wolfe: *Conservatism, Radicalism, and Scientific Method,* Macmillan, 1923.

CHAPTER XXIII

1. See Arthur E. P. Weigall, *The Life and Times of Akhnaton, Pharoah of Egypt,* Putnam's, 1923. 2. See an article, "Moh Tih—One of the Immortals," by Harry Kingman, in *Unity,* August 22, 1927. Also for light on Mo-Ti and Akhnaton see a sermon by John Haynes Holmes, *The Community Pulpit,* Series 1927-1928, No. IX, on *Forgotten Christs.* And see, especially, a recent translation of *The Ethical and Political Works of*

Mo-Tse, translated by Y. P. Mei. Probsthain, London. 3. See *History of the Waldensians,* anonymous, published 1829 by the American Sunday School Union. This is a bigoted little book, but it supplies an interesting outline if read critically. It does not mention the pacifism of the group! While there are many sources of information on this sect and some of the ones subsequently dealt with, the best general summary is to be found in *Non-Violent Coercion,* by Clarence Marsh Case. 4. *Spiritual Reformers in the 16th and 17th Centuries,* by Rufus M. Jones. 5. *The Quaker in the Forum,* by Amelia Mott Gummere, Winston, 1910. 6. This verse is taken from a collection of early Quaker papers known as the Abram Rawlinson Barclay MSS., in the Library of the Friends' House, London. It was initialed "J. S.," and dated "4th mo. 1662." Punctuation has been added for sake of clarity, but the original spelling is retained. See *The Wayfarer, A Record of Quaker Life and Work,* London, November, 1928. 7. See *The Doukhobors: Their History in Russia, Their Migration to Canada,* by Joseph Elkinton, 1903. 8. *The American Indian Frontier,* by William Christie MacLeod. Alfred A. Knopf, 1928. 9. *A Narrative of the Life of Mrs. Mary Jemison, Who Was Taken by the Indians, in the Year 1755, when Only about Twelve Years of Age and Has Continued to Reside Amongst Them to the Present Time,* by James E. Seaver, edition of 1824. 10. *The First Americans,* by Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker, p. 224. 11. For the treatment of real Tories and suspects also, see *Loyalists in the American Revolution,* by Charles H. Van Tyne. 12. *Journal of the Life, Travels and Gospel Labours of that Faithful Servant and Minister of Christ, Job Scott,* edition of 1797, pp. 52-53. 13. See *The Rogerenes,* by John R. Bolles and Anna B. Williams, 1904. 14. *The Calumet* for July and August, 1833. 15. See the excellent account in Leon Whipple's *The Story of Civil Liberty in the United States,* Vanguard Press, 1927, chapter IV. 16. Quoted by Whipple from *Southern Heroes,* by Fernando C. Cartland. 17. *The Revolt of a Quaker Conscience,* with an introduction by Rufus M. Jones, Macmillan, 1918. 18. For this correspondence in full see *The Quakers in Peace and War,* by Margaret E. Hirst, pp. 428-29. 19. *Second Report of the Provost Marshal General to the Secretary of War on the Operations of the Selective Service System to December 30, 1918,* p. 288. 20. Same, p. 201. 21. See especially *The Conscientious Objector in America,* by Norman Thomas, Huebsch, 1923 (republished by the Vanguard Press in a cheaper edition as *Is Conscience a Crime?*); *Conscription and Conscience,* by John W. Graham, Allen and Unwin, 1919. In addition, Major Walter Guest Kellogg, an army officer who had to deal with conscientious objectors, has sought to be fair and tolerant, if he is not always penetrating, in *The Conscientious Objector,* Boni and Liveright, 1919. For its dispassionate sociological neutrality, Clarence Marsh Case's *Non-Violent Coercion* is invaluable. 22. Norman Thomas: *The Conscientious Objector in America,* p. 15. 23. John W. Graham: *Conscription and Conscience,* p. 349. 24. *Second Report of the Provost Marshal General,* p. 61. 25. See *Non-Violent Coercion,* pp. 182-84; or *The Journal of Delinquency,* March, 1920. 26. See *The American Journal of Psychology,* April, 1920, or *Non-Violent Coercion,* pp. 185-86. 27. Winthrop D. Lane, in *The New Republic* for April 14, 1920. Cited by Norman Thomas in *The Conscientious Objector in America,* p. 17. 28. Appendix D, p. 323, of the *Second Report of the Provost Marshal General.* 29. *Fighting for Peace,* by W. J. Chamberlain. No More War Movement, 1928. 30. R. Clifford Allen. See *I Appeal unto Cæsar, The Case of the Conscientious Objector,* by Mrs. Henry Hobhouse, Allen and Unwin, 1917. 31. *The Conscientious Objector in America,* pp. 284-85.

CHAPTER XXIV

1. See *Modern Martyrs,* War Resisters' International, 11 Abbey Road, Enfield, Middlesex, England. 2. From *War Resisters of Many Lands,* a booklet, 1928, of the War Resisters' International. 3. Peace Letters or declarations have been prepared and circulated in the United States by a Seattle group of the Fellowship of Reconciliation (while the national body does not offer such a Letter, its membership is free to do so), the Women's Peace Society, the Women's Peace Union, and, most extensively, by the War Resisters' League. While these differ to some extent in thir wording, they are alike in the definiteness with which the signers repudiate war service. In addition a number of declarations varying from war resistance to refusal of service under certain conditions have been circulated by groups of college and university students and young people's societies in certain churches and labor organizations. 4. *United States Army Training Manual No. 2, Studies in Citizenship for Citizens Military Training Camps,* 1922, p. 26. 5. *The Handwriting on the Wall, a Chemist's Interpretation,* p. 171. Little, Brown, 1928. 6. See *Violence and the Labor Movement,* by Robert Hunter, 1914. 7. *A History of Socialist Thought,* by Harry W. Laidler, p. 119, Crowell, 1927. 8. *The Open Conspiracy,* by H. G. Wells, p. 134, Doubleday, Doran, 1928. 9. See Adin Ballou's *Christian Non-Resistance* for many instances of personal and group non-violent resistance; also *The Principles of Peace Exemplified,* etc., by Thomas Hancock, previously cited; a little booklet entitled *The Arm of God,* is valuable; a modern instance of Christian pacifism of a very striking kind is that of Edward C. M. Richards' article in the *Atlantic Monthly* for May, 1923, entitled "The Test of Faith—A Chapter in Non-Resistance." 10. See "Pacifism in Personal Relations," by John Haynes Holmes, a chapter of *Pacifism in the Modern World,* edited by Devere Allen, Doubleday, Doran, 1929. 11. Ballou, p. 153. 12. See *The Journal of Religion,* October, 1928, for an article by Oscar A. Marti. Also this article was abstracted by J. T. McNeill for *Social Science Abstracts,* May, 1929. 13. See *Non-Coöperation in Other Lands,* by A. Fenner Brockway, a booklet published in India after its appearance as a series of articles in the magazine *India* in the issue of October 15, 1920, and successive numbers; also see a chapter, "Does Non-Coöperation Succeed?" by A. Fenner Brockway, in *Pacifism in the Modern World,* edited by Devere Allen. For a good discussion of non-violent resistance, see John Nevin Sayre's chapter in *Pacifism in the Modern World,* entitled "The Quest for National Security." 14. *Thoughts and Things at Home and Abroad,* by Elihu Burritt, edition of 1854, pp. 270-271. 15. See *Thoughts and Things,* etc., by Burritt, p. 272. 16. See *Non-Coöperation in Other Lands,* by A. Fenner Brockway, above. 17. *Non-Violent Coercion,* p. 329. 18. See *Non-Violent Coercion,* pp. 288-295. There is an abundant literature on the Korean episode, and though much of it is of the nature of partisan propaganda it is substantiated for the most part beyond dispute. For the background see C. W. Kendall, *The Truth About Korea,* F. A. McKenzie's *Korea's Fight For Freedom,* and numerous magazine and newspaper articles of the period as well as reports of missionaries. 19. See A. Fenner Brockway's chapter on "Does Non-Coöperation Succeed?" in *Pacifism in the Modern World,* cited above. 20. Oswald Garrison Villard, in *The Nation,* November 28, 1923. 21. Debate in the House of Commons May 17, 1927, over Clause One of the Trade Disputes and Trade Unions Bill. See a brief excerpt in *No More War* for June,, 1927. 22. See Rufus M. Jones' excellent and balanced work, *The Quakers in the American Col-*

onies. 23. *Rebel Saints,* by Mary Agnes Best, p. 237, Harcourt, Brace, 1925. 24. See *The Revolt of Youth,* by Stanley High, pp. 171-90. 25. Quoted by Clarence Marsh Case, in *Non-Violent Coercion,* p. 339, from *The Christian Science Monitor,* April 7, 1920. 26. See *The Psychology and Strategy of Gandhi's Non-Violent Resistance,* by Richard B. Gregg, S. Ganesan, Triplicane, Madras, 1929. Also see a pamphlet by Kirby Page, 1930, *Is Mahatma Gandhi the Greatest Man of the Age?* 27. See "How the Fast Was Broken," an article by C. F. Andrews in *Young India,* October 16, 1924. 28. "The Akali Movement—an Heroic Epic," by Agnes Smedley, in *The Nation,* July 2, 1924; also "Who Are the Akalis?" in the *United States of India,* March, 1924. 29. On this point compare Leon Trotsky's *Whither England?* with Norman Angell's *Must Britain Travel the Moscow Road?* 30. *Theories of Social Progress,* by Arthur James Todd, pp. 111-12, Macmillan, 1926.

CHAPTER XXV

1. The question was put to Professor Einstein and other notables by the paper *Die Wahrheit* (Truth) of Prague, and the answers, many of them censored, were printed in the same journal. In Europe the famous mathematician's pacifism is well known. 2. John Bakeless, *The Origin of the Next War,* Viking Press, 1926. 3. *Revolt in the Desert,* by Col. T. E. Lawrence, p. 317, Doran, 1926. 4. *A Private in the Guards,* by Stephen Graham, p. 2, Macmillan, 1910. 5. *Under Fire* (Le Feu), by Henri Barbusse, p. 240, Dutton, 1917. 6. *Pacifism in the Modern World.* 7. From an article on "Christianity or War," in *The Churchman,* September 26, 1925. 8. *The Stakes of Diplomacy,* by Walter Lippmann, Holt, 1915. 9. *Non-Violent Coercion,* p. 195. 10. *Social Progress,* by Ulysses G. Weatherly, Lippincott, 1926. 11. Kirby Page in *The Abolition of War,* by Sherwood Eddy and Kirby Page, pp. 201-202, Doran, 1924. 12. From *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson,* edited by Ford, Vol. IV, and quoted by Harry Elmer Barnes, in *History and Social Intelligence,* p. 315, Knopf, 1926. 13. See on this point an article on "Executive Assumption of the War-making Power," by the late Albert H. Putney, Professor of Constitutional Law in the National University Law School, in *The National University Law Review,* May, 1927. This article has been reprinted as a public document: Senate Document No. 39, 70th Congress, 1st. Session, and is obtainable from the Superintendent of Public Documents, Washington, D. C. 14. See an article on "Liberty and Sovereignty," by George W. Martin, in *The Atlantic Monthly,* July, 1926. 15. From a speech by a Bulgarian war resister, printed in *The War Resister,* May, 1928. 16. Trasnlation by Wm. Whewell, Cambridge, 1853, Vol. IV, chapter 26, pp. 290-294. 17. See an illuminating discussion of "Pacifism and the State" by A. Bruce Curry, in *Pacifism and the Modern World.* 18. From an article on "The Dangers of Obedience," by Harold J. Laski, in *Harper's Magazine,* June, 1929. Also see the same writer's volume, *Authority in the Modern State.* 19. *A Subaltern on the Somme,* by "Mark VII," p. 126, Dutton, 1928. 20. This quotation, with more matter to the same end, is used in the *United States Army Training Manual, No. 1,* of the Studies in Citizenship for Recruits. 21. Quoted from *Our Military Policy,* by Lt.-Col. P. S. Bond. 22. From the translation of *Die Persönlichkeit und die Bedingungen ihrer Entwicklung und Gesundheit,* by W. v. Bechterew, appearing in *An Introduction to the Science of Sociology,* by Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, University of Chicago Press, 1927. 23. *Christianity and Social Adventuring,* by Francis J. McConnell, p. 56. 24. Professor Floyd H. Allport, "The

Psychology of Nationalism," in *Harper's Magazine,* August, 1927. 25. From an article by Viscount Haldane, on "Higher Nationality," quoted in *An Introduction to the Science of Sociology,* above. 26. See an article on "A Pedagogic Sunset," by Vida D. Scudder, in *The Atlantic Monthly,* June, 1928. 27. *Theories of Social Progress,* by Todd, above. 28. Bishop Paul Jones, in a chapter on "The Meaning of Pacifism," in *Pacifism in the Modern World.*

CHAPTER XXVI

1. *The Olives of Endless Age,* by H. N. Brailsford, p. 32, Harper, 1928. 2. Gen. Jomini: *Summary of the Art of War.* American Edition, 1854, p. 5. 3. Francis P. Garvan, quoted in the New York *Times,* September 12, 1929. 4. The Very Reverend Howard Chandler Robbins, in the New York *Times,* August 11, 1929. 5. See an article, "Man and His Young World," by Harlow Shapley, in *The Nation,* May 7, 1924.

Best, Mary Agnes, 559
Bethmann-Hollweg, von, 107
Better America Federation, 247, 348
Bible House, New York City, 436
Biddle, Clement, 240
Bigelow, Tyler, 155
Binkley, Richard, 580
Birney, James G., 399
Birth Control, 517
Bishops, as arbitrators, 123
Bismarck, 213
Black Agnes, Countess of March, 264
"Blacksmith, The Learned" (Elihu Burritt), 399
Blackwell, Antoinette Brown, 274
Blaine, and arbitration, 128
Blair, Montgomery, 440
Blake, Mrs. Sarah, 267
Blanchard, Joshua P., 66, 325, 411, 434, 453, 468, 519
  pacifist activities during Civil War, 456
  resignation from American Peace Society, 415
  References, Ch. XVIII, Note 44, 711
Bliokh, Jan, 212, 296, 494
Bliss, Gen. Tasker H., 57
Bloch, Jean (See Jan Bliokh)
Boadicea, Queen, 263
Bodin, Jean, 233
Boeckel, Florence Brewer, 281
Boerhaave, Herman, 343
Bogart, E. L., 164
Bogue, David, 3, 264
Bohemian Brethren, 532, 574
Bok, Edward, 242
Bolles, John A., 410
Bolles, John R., References, Ch. XXIII, Note 13, 713
Bonaparte, Napoleon, 101, 159, 210, 324, 647
Boncour, Paul, 328; bill for conscription, 225
Bond, Col. P. S., 68, 326
Bond of Brotherhood, The, References, Ch. IV, Note 5, 703
Bonnor, Abbé Honoré, 89
Borah, William E., 177, 179, 182, 187, 191, 648
Bossuet, J. B., 210
Bourne, Randolph, ix
Boutwell, George S., 490
Boycotting an Aggressor, 76
Boy Scouts of America, 319, 341
Brailsford, H. N., 673
Branting, Hjalmar, 242
Brantome, Abbé de, quoted, 14
Brayshaw, Alfred Neave, References, Ch. XXII, Note 10, 712
Breasted, James A., 568
Brent, Bishop Charles H., 329
Brewer, Justice David J., 282
Briand, Aristide, 107, 110, 615
Bright, John, 502
British Coöperative Congress, and war resistance, 616
British Labor, prevention of war against Russia—1920, 633
British Labor Party, 162; Margate war resistance resolution, 616
Brockway, A. Fenner, 236, 629, quoted, 60; References, Ch. XXIV, Note 13, 714
Brooks, Charles, 267, 344, 460
Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 168
Brown, Commander E. W., 309
Brown, H. Runham, 190, 608, 617
Brown, Susan (wife of Alfred H. Love), 470
Browne, Francis F., References, Ch. XVIII, Note 33, 711
Brownell, Mrs. Kady, 273
Brussels Conference for the Protection of Civilians, 312
Brussels, Peace Conference of 1848, 432
Bryan, William Jennings, 132, 248, 504
Bryan-Chamorro Treaty, with Nicaragua, 130
Bryant, William Cullen, 278, 448
Buckingham, Lord, 202
Buckinjehillish, 579
Buckle, 211
Buckley, James M., 201
Buddha, 7, 532, 569; on war as distinct from personal violence, 557
Buisson, M., 242
Bülow, von, 235
Bungay, George W., References, Ch. XVII, Note 5, 710
Bunker Hill, and weapons of Colonial troops, 294; monument, 271
Burchard, Rev. Dr., "rum, romanism, and rebellion," 128
Burgess, Ernest W., References, Ch. XXV, Note 22, 715

Burke, Edmund, 300
Burr-Hamilton Duel, 184
Burritt, Elihu, 36, 167, 177, 225, 279, 301, 399, 411, 425, 427, 432, 453, 455, 456, 519, 610, 626
and abolition, 406
and "Compensated Emancipation," 435
and Labor, 431
and war with Mexico, 412, 413
plan for "ocean penny postage," 435
quoted, 388
sketch of, 399
statement of reasons for separation from American Peace Society—1846, 417
Burton, Theodore E., 76
Busch, Julius Herman Moritz, References, Ch. XI, Note 27, 707
Bush, George, 374
Bustamente, Antonio de, 123, 212
Bustard, Dr., 40
Butler, General, 447
Byron, Lord, 264

Cadman, S. Parkes, 61
Cadoux, C. J., 17
Calhoun, John C., 106
Call, Arthur Deerin, References, Ch. I, Note 3, 701; Ch. XIX, Note 7, 711
Calumet, The, References, Ch. IV, Note 5, 703
Camp, Kearney, R. O. T. C. instructor, 332
Camp, William Penn, 451
Campbell, David, 585
Cape of Good Hope, non-violent victory at, 637
Capital Punishment, difference of opinion on, in the peace societies, 408
Capper-Johnson Bill, 328
Carlyle, 137
Carnegie, Andrew, 128, 250, 380, 496, 498, 500, 508, 553
Carnegie, Corporation of New York, war grants, 508
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 210, 507, 556
Carnegie medal, given to conscientious objector in Leavenworth, 592
Carter, Arabella, 473; References, 701, Ch. XIX, Note 5, 711
Carter, John, 139
Case, Clarence Marsh, 531, 557, 575, 592, 598, 629, 636, 655; Non-Violent Coercion, 83
Case, William Mole, 40
Cathari, 571, 573
Cathedral of St. John the Divine, and prize fighting, 203
Catlin, Jacob, 213
Catt, Carrie Chapman, 245, 286
Causes of War, as found by Massachusetts Peace Societies Committee of Inquiry, 153, Appendix II, 686
Cavert, Samuel McCrae, 48
Cecil, Lord Robert, 61
Central American Court of Justice, 130
Central Pennsylvania Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 53
Century Magazine, 201
Chace, "Honest Jonathan," 480
Chadwick, John White, 502
Chadwick, Rear Admiral F. E., 501
Chalmers, Thomas, 214
Cham (See Noé, Amédée de), 295
Chamberlain, L. T., 486
Chamberlain, Senator George E., tribute to women for war work, 284
Chamberlain, W. J., References, Ch. XXIII, Note 29, 713
Chandler, Senator, of Michigan, 440
Channing, Walter, M.D., 414, 415, 426, 460
Channing, William Ellery, 4, 63, 365, 391, 405
Chaplains, Military, 18
Chapman, Maria, 269, 395
Chase, Mrs. Ann, 270
Chemical Warfare Service, 308
Chessman, Daniel, 8, 10
Child, Lydia Maria, 408, 624
China, intervention in, 48
Chipman, Richard M., 374
Christ of the Andees, 554; peace monument, 286
Christadelphians, 590
Christian Brotherhood, Dutch pacifist group, 576
Christian Century, The, 177

Christian Citizen, The, References, Ch. IV, Note 5, 703
Christians, Early, 532, 570, 659
Christian Pacifists of Los Angeles, 503
Christian Socialist, The, 505
Chrysostom, 381
Chrysostum, Dion, 529
Church Peace Union, 42, 240, 508
Churchill, Winston, 290, 313
Cicero, 502
Cimolians, 121
Citizens' Military Training Camps, number attending, 335
City of the Horizon, of Akhnaton, 567
Civil Liberties Bureau, 503
Civil War, 37
  Atrocity Charges in, 444
  Desertion in, 326
  and the Peace Movement, 439
  Use of Draft by Confederacy and Union, 326
Clark, Ida Clyde, References, Ch. XIII, Note 12, 708
Clark, Rufus W., 21
Clarke, James Freeman, 460
Clarkson, Thomas, 17
Clay, Henry, 184
Clemenceau, Georges, 252
Cleveland, Aaron, 8
Cleveland, President, 128
Clews, Henry, 498
Clovis, King of the Franks, 122
Clutton-Brock, Arthur, 121
Coan, Titus, References, Ch. III, Note 22, 702
Coast Guard, 317
Cobden, Richard, 430, 432
Cock, Thomas, M.D., 381
Coggswell, Jonathan, 381
Collegiants, 575
Collegiate Anti-Militarism League, 503
Colombia, 130
Committee on Militarism in Education, 344
Committee on Public Information, 205, 508
Commons, John R., 164
Community Recreation Service, 509
Community of True Inspiration, 578
Compensated Emancipation, Burritt's plan to avert Civil War, 434
Conflicts since the Beginning of the Organized Peace Movement, 1815-1929 inclusive, Appendix I, 679
Conference on the Cause and Cure of War, 76, 248, 286
Confucius, 7, 569
Congress of Nations, 64
Congress of Vienna, 102, 628
Connecticut Peace Society, Address of Thomas S. Grimké before, 377
Connecticut, State of, peace celebration of Armistice Day, 546
Conscientious Objectors, 538; in World War, 588
Conscription, in World War, 327
Constant, Baron d'Estournelles de, 283
Constantine, 29, 571
Constitution, trip through waterways for propaganda, 354
Cook, Mrs. Anthony Wayne, 258
Cooke, Bishop Richard J., 40
Cooley, Charles H., References, Ch. VIII, Note 16, 705
Coolidge, Calvin, 76, 168, 186, 208
Copernican, Astronomy, 139
Coöperative Women's Guilds, and war resistance, 617
Corbin, Margaret, 270
Corcyreans, 121
Corinthians, 121
Cost of War Preparations, table showing increases in proportion to population, 318
Costa, Angela de, 481
Costa, Señora O. C. Angela de, 286
Coues, Samuel E., 225, 415, 425, 426
Council of Women for Home Missions, 286
Covenant of the League of Nations, 61, 74, 108
Cramb, 138
Crandall, Prudence, 563
Cranston, Sir Robert, 250
Crapsey, Algernon S., 496
Creel, George, 205
Creel Bureau, 252
Creighton, Bishop, 210
Cremer, Sir William Randal, 129
Crewe House, 204
Crimean War, 433
Cromwell, Oliver, 210
Crosby, Ernest Howard, 39, 43, 461, 534

Crucé, Emeric, 90
Cuban Debt, refusal of U. S. to arbitrate, 130
Cuban Rebellion, 483
Curry, A. Bruce, References, Ch. XXV, Note 17, 715
Curti, M. E., 431; References, 701; Ch. VII, Note 9, 704; Ch. XVIII, Note 10, 710

Dabney, Virginius, References, Ch. XII, Note 15, 707
Daimling, Gen. von, 312
Daniels, Cora, 276
Daniels, Josephus, tribute to women for aid in war, 285
Dante, 89
Darius, King of Persia, 121
Darrow, Clarence, 505
Daughters of the American Revolution, 247, 258, 319, 348, 406, 553
Davidson, Robert, 32
Davies, President Samuel, of Princeton, 31
Davis, Dwight F., 304
Davis, Elnathan, 453
Davis, Jefferson, 294
Davis, Mary F., 278
Dawes, Charles G., 143, 242
Dawes Plan, 630
Dawes, Thomas, 33, 104, 141
Dawson, Capt. Francis, References, Ch. XIII, Note 6, 708
Deak, Francis, 625
Deborah, 263
Debs, Eugene V., 157, 450, 503, 596
Declaration of Principles, New England Non-Resistance Society—1838, 395, Appendix V, 694
Declarations of war, 648
Defense Day, 47 (See Mobilization Day)
"Defensive" War, 69
Delafield, Col. R., 78, 294
Demilitarized Zones, violation of, as aggression, 71; References, Ch. V, Note 15, 703
Democratic National Convention—1924, 462
Democrats, and intervention in European revolutions, 429
Desaguliers, pioneer in underwater torpedoes, 295
Desai, Mahadev, 640
Desertion during the Civil War, 147
Devens, Bridget, or "Michigan Bridget," 273
Devil's Business, The, play, 236
Devil's Island, war objectors sent to, 595
Dewey, John, 145, 177
Dewey, L. D., 241
Deyo, Rev. Amanda, 473
Dick, Dr. Thomas, 300
Dieffenbach, Albert C., 41
Dillon, E. J., 494
Dillon, George, References, Ch. XIV, Note 10, 708
Diman, J. Lewis, References, Ch. XXII, Note 9, 712
Ditmann, Herr, 632
Dix, Dorothea, 408
Dixon, Thomas, 461
Dodge, Cleveland H., 339, 505
Dodge, David Low, 4, 7, 15, 49, 62, 140, 200, 206, 223, 339, 399, 466, 519, 527, 581
  on capital punishment, 408
  on governments, 410
  sketch of, 361
Doheny, E. L., 352
"Don't Give Up the Ship," motion picture, 351
Doukhobors, 578
Draft Boards, 538
Draft Riots, during Civil War, 326
Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance, 108
Drake, J. Rodman, References, Ch. XVIII, Note 20, 710
Drake, Samuel Adams, References, Ch. XVII, Note 5, 710
Dresser, Amos, 427
Drew, Thomas, Jr., 417, 427
Dreyse, Johann Nicholas von, inventor of the needle gun, 294
Drown, Thomas, resignation from American Peace Society, 415
Duchemin, Angelique, 264
Ducommun, Elie, 473, 481
Duelling, and outlawry of war, 183
Duganne, A. J. H., References, Ch. XVIII, Note 39, 711
Duke of Bohemia, 264
Dunkards, 532, 572, 585
Dunkers (See Dunkards), 576
Dwight, President Timothy, of Yale, 503, 544
Dymond, Jonathan, 17, 156, 161, 206

Dyott, Commander George M., 549

Eaton, Charles A., 40
Eddy, Sherwood, References, Ch. XI, Note 20, 706
Edmunds, Sterling E., 233
Education and Peace, 250
Edwards, Major William W., 332
Edwards, T. J., References, Ch. XXII, Note 7, 712
Egypt, non-violent demonstration in, 629
Einstein, Albert, on war resistance, 648; quoted, 388
Eleans, 122
Elector Friedrich Wilhelm, of Hesse-Cassel, 627
Elizabeth, Queen, 90
Elk Hills Basin, 352
Elkinton, Joseph, References, Ch. XXIII, Note 7, 713
Ellet, Elizabeth F., 271
Ely, William, 374, 383
Emancipation Proclamation, largely a military measure, 440
Emergency Peace Federation, 503
Emerson, Mrs. B. A. C., 554
Emerson, Ralph, 446
Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 389, 643
Emery, H. C., 158
Engelbrecht, H. C., References, 701; Ch. XI, Note 17, 706
Ephrata Communists, 578
Equal Rights Party, 276
Erasmus, 9, 90
Esperanto, 518
Espionage Act, 595
Essenes, 529, 659
Etheridge, Annie, 273
European Revolutions, and the American peace movement, 409, 428
Evarts, William M., 167
Everett, William, 489
Evreinoff, Anna, 495

Fairchild, Governor of Vermont, 436
Faunce, President W. H. P., of Brown, 502
Fawcett, Joseph, References, Ch. X, Note 2, 706
Fear, as a deterrent from war, 211
Federal Council of Churches, 47, 48, 49, 54; war-time message—1917, 41
Federation of Women's Boards of Foreign Missions of North America, 286
Fellowes, Francis, on capital punishment, 409
Female Peace Society, of Cincinnati, 266
Fénelon, 120
Ferrer, Francisco, 632
Ferris, David, References, Ch. XXII, Note 12, 712
Fellowship of Reconciliation, 163, 503, 512, 590, 609; References, Ch. XXIV, Note 3, 714
Field, Noel H., References, Ch. VII, Note 17, 705
Fish, Carl Russell, References, Ch. X, Note 7, 706
Fish, Hamilton, Jr., 77
Fisher, Lord, 235
Fiske, Rear Admiral Bradley A., 79
Flag Code, 353
Flag, Peace, 553
Flag Salute, 330
Flamm, Oswald, 298
Fleet, German, refusal of sailors to take out after Armistice, 633
Flexner, Abraham, References, Ch. XI, Note 7, 706
Foch, General, 42
Ford, Henry, and the *Oscar II*, 501
Foreign Policy Association, 512
Fort Pillow, massacre at, 444
Fosdick, Harry Emerson, 653
Fosdick, Raymond B., 234
Foster, John W., 39
Foster, N. L., 266
Foster, Stephen, on Mexican War, 414
Four Minute Men, 205
Fox, George, 18, 559, 577, 636
France, Anatole, 664
Francis, James A., 40
Francis, St., 362, 572
Franciscan Monks, as military chaplains, 557
Franco-Prussian War, 67, 477
Frankfort, Peace Conference of 1850, 432
Frankfurter, Felix, 182
Franklin, Benjamin, 196, 215; quoted, 292
Franklin, Rev. Benjamin, evangelist, 37
Fraticelli, 572

Frazier Amendment, References, Ch. XIII, Note 15, 708
Frazier, Lynn J., 246; and Constitutional Amendment prohibiting war and war preparations, 289
Frazier, Solomon, 586
Frederick the Great, and Mennonites, 575
Free Soil Party, and arbitration, 126
Free Trade, 517
French Academy, 239
French and Indian Wars, 31
French, Capt. William H., References, Ch. XIV, Note 4, 708
French National Peace Congress, on war resistance, 617
French Society of the Friends of Peace, 128
Freud, Sigmund, 138
Fried, Alfred H., 242
Friend of Peace, The, 10; References, Ch. IV, Note 5, 703
Friends, Society of, 532, 576
and Alexander I of Russia, 101
and war, 559
and women, 283
in Ireland—1798, 623
(See Quakers), 101
Frothingham, Octavius, 278
Fuller, Margaret, 270
Futcher, C. P., References, Ch. V, Note 26, 703

Gaiazzo, Count de, 264
Gale, Nahum, References, Ch. III, Note 5, 702
Galileo, 139
Galitzin, Prince, of Russia, 102
Gallaudet, S. H., 551
Gandhi, Mahatma, 557, 558, 639
Gannett, Ezra Stiles, 453, 460
Ganster, Howard, 40
Garner, J. W., 130
Garrison, George Thompson, 450
Garrison, William Lloyd, 17, 165, 234, 267, 268, 390, 399, 406, 439, 478, 558, 657
in Civil War, 449
letter to his wife about New England Non-Resistance Society, 393
on meaning of non-resistance, 533
speaking at Fort Sumter celebration, 450
Garrison, William Lloyd, sonnet to William Ladd, 390
and Elihu Burritt's plan for "compensated emancipation," 436
Garrison, William Lloyd (the second), 489
Garvan, Francis P., References, Ch. XXVI, Note 3, 716
Gary, Elbert H., 138, 304
Gauls, and Cæsar's war machines, 211
Gautama (See Buddha), 569
General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church, 54
General Conference of Methodist Episcopal Church, 52
General Federation of Women's Clubs, 286
General Strike for Peace, 615
Geneva Protocol, 108
Genoa and Venice, treaty of alliance, 123
Gepidæ, 122
German Trade Union Congress, and war resistance, 616
Gianibelli, Italian engineer, 295
Gibbs, Dr. H. A., 170
Gibbs, Sir Philip, 47
Gilman, N. P., 502
Ginn, Edwin, 500, 507
Gladden, Washington, 240
Gompers, Samuel, 505
Goodrich, Admiral, 248
Goodrich, Frederick E., References, Ch. XVIII, Note 1, 710
Good Will Congress, 76
Goold, Nathan, References, Ch. VIII, Note 22, 705
Gordon, Gen. "Chinese," 165
Government, Mobilization of, 315
Governments, peace leaders of early movement on, 410
Graham, John W., 592
Graham, Stephen, References, Ch. VIII, Note 26, 705
Grand Design, of King Henry IV and the Duke of Sully, 90
Granger, J. N., 407
Grant, Gen. U. S., 316; President, 478; and Alabama arbitration, 451
Grant, Raymond, References, Ch. VIII, Note 1, 705
Great Illusion, The, 214
Greeley, Horace, 439, 478

Gregg, Richard B., References, Ch. XXIV, Note 26, 715
Gregory, Professor of Oxford, 307
Grellet, Stephen, 102
Grey, Viscount, 107
Griffin, E. D., 364
Griffing, Josephine, 276
Grimké, Angelina, 267, 375
Grimké, Sarah, 267, 375, 379
Grimké, Thomas S., 34, 55, 241, 253, 372, 375, 384, 438, 584
Grotius, Hugo, 91, 140, 210, 233, 659
Groves, Brig. Gen., P. R. C., 311, 312
Grubb, Isabel, References, Ch. XVI, Note 11, 709
Guadalupe Hidalgo, Treaty of, 126
Gummere, Amelia Mott, References, Ch. XXIII, Note 5, 713
Gurney, Eliza, 587
Gurney, Joseph John, 17; Garrison on, 391
Gwynne, Captain, 598

Haber, Professor, on gas warfare, 312
Hague, The, conferences, 131, 493
Haldane, Lord, 674; References, Ch. XXV, Note 25, 716
Hale, Edward Everett, 67, 131, 180, 257, 445, 495
Hall, Robert, 308
Hammond, John Hays, 505
Hancock, Thomas, M.D., 377, 623
Hanseatic League, 123
Harbinger of Peace, The, References, Ch. IV, Note 5, 703
Harbord, Gen. J. G., 138
Hardie, Keir, 613, 616
Harding, President, 158, 328
Harries, Gen. George H., 237
Harrison, President Benjamin, 39
Harrow, Benjamin, 306, 314
Harte, Bret, 449
Hartford County Peace Society, 34
Hartford Settlement, 30
Hastings, Charles, 474
Hawaiian Islands, non-violent resistance to French attack, 626
Hawkins, Sir John, 30
Hay, John, 248
Hayes, Carlton J. H., References, Ch. XII, Note 5, 707
Hays, Will, 350
Headley, J. T., 31
Hearst, William Randolph, 484, 490
Heaton, Adna, 9
Hemmenway, John, References, Ch. XVI, Note 8, 709
Henrotin, Ellen M., 282
Henry, C. S., 141, 536
Henry IV, King, 90
Herculians, 122
Herman, Raphael, 242
Hesse-Cassel, non-violent resistance in, 627
Hesse-Rheinfels, Ernest Landgrave of, or Hessen-Rheinfels, or Hesse-Cassel, 91
Heywood, Ezra, 290, 468
Hezekiah, 5, 68
Hicks, Granville, References, Ch. IX, Note 13, 706
Hiero of Syracuse, 122
Higginson, Thomas Wentworth, 447
High, Stanley, References, Ch. XXIV, Note 24, 715
Hill, Adjutant General Jeremiah, 146
Hill, John Wesley, 499
Hillis, Newell Dwight, 41, 498
Hinkle, Dr. Beatrice, 282
Hirschfield, David, 346
Hirst, Margaret E., References, Ch. XVIII, Note 38, 711
Hoar, Senator, 487
Hobbes, Thomas, 107
Hobhouse, Mrs. Henry, References, Ch. XXIII, Note 30, 713
Hobhouse, L. T., quoted, 602
Hobson, Capt. Richmond P., 493
Hocking, W. E., 145, 660
Holbrook's *Military Tactics,* on the art of war, 306
Holcomb, Governor of Connecticut, 40
Holland, Frederick, 414
Holm, Gen. Fritz V., 227
Holmes, John Haynes, 68, 177, 534, 536; References, Ch. XXIII, Note 2, 712; Ch. XXIV, Note 10, 714
Holmes, Oliver Wendell, 389, 448
Holt, Hamilton, 107
Holy Alliance, or Holy League, 101
Hoover, President, 107; authorization of study into a plan for conscription, 330

Hopkins, President Mark, of Williams College, 436
Horn, Trader, 549
Horsch, John, References, Ch. XI, Note 9ff., 706
Houghton, Alanson B., 229
Howard, Frank Key, 441
Howe, Julia Ward, 276, 280, 285, 448, 478
Howe, Samuel Gridley, 460
Howitt, Mary, References, Ch. XVII, Note 5, 710
Hubbard, Dr., of Windham County (Conn.) Peace Society, 377
Huerta, 130
Hughes, Rupert, 206
Hugo, Victor, 211, 432, 674
Hull, Major William, 270
Hull, Sarah, 270
Hull, William I., 111
Human Nature, and original nature, 144
Hunt, Capt. H. J., References, Ch. XIV, Note 4, 708
Hunter, Robert, References, Ch. XXIV, Note 6, 714
Hurley, Edward N., 159
Huss, John, 573
Hutchins, I. T., 453
Hutchinson, John, 476
Hyerapytna, 122

Ido, 518
Illinois Miner, 166
Independent Labor Party, and war resistance, 616
Indians, American, peace prophets among, 579
Industrial Defense Association, 247
Industry, Mobilization of, 301
Ingenhousz, Johannes, 215
Inquisition, 139
Institute for Public Service, 256
Inter-church World Movement, 42
Intercollegiate Peace Association, 498
International Anti-Militaristic Bureau, 608
International Anti-Militaristic Commission, 608
International Council of Women, 281, 496
International Federation of Trade Unions, 616
International Miners' Congress, and war resistance, 616
International Peace Bureau, 553
International Peace Bureau, and Alfred H. Love, 473
International Peace Conferences, 1889 to 1913, 480
International Peace Congresses, 1924 and 1926, on war resistance, 617
International Peace Forum, 499
International Polity Clubs, 498
International Red Cross, 312
International School of Peace, 500
International Socialist Bureau, 616
International Textile Workers, and war resistance, 616
International Trade Union Congress, and war resistance, 616
International Union of Anti-Militarist Clergymen, 617
International Workingmen's Association, 608
International Workingmen's Association, General Council, on Franco-Prussian War, 167
Ireland, Most Reverend John, 498
Ireland, resistance to conscription, 630
Irenæus, 570
Irish Rebellion, 377
Isaiah, 568
I. W. W., 505

Jackson, E. W., resignation from American Peace Society, 415, 460
Jackson, John, 412
Jackson, President, 182, 373
James, Apostle, quoted, 135; 529
James, Edmund J., References, Ch. VIII, Note 25, 705
James, W. Frank, 299, 330
Jaurès, Jean, 616
Jay, John, 124, 156; letter to Noah Worcester, 141
Jay, William, 35, 66, 156, 217, 268, 343, 430; and stipulated arbitration, 125
Jefferson, Thomas, 210, 657; letter to Noah Worcester, 209
Jenkins, Charles, 33
Jennings, Walter W., References, Ch. IX, Note 14, 706
Jeremiah, 568
Jerome, 381

Jerrold, Douglas, 502
Jessup, Philip C., 130
Jesus, 7, 16, 50, 163, 529, 530, 532, 567, 571, 572, 609, 618
Jewish Welfare Board, 504
Joan, Saint, 264
Jomini, Baron de, 673
Johnsen, Julia E., References, Ch. VI, Note 1, 704
Johnson, Oliver, letter from William Lloyd Garrison, 449; References, Ch. XVII, Note 4, 710
Johnson, Samuel, 236
Johnston, R. M., 158
Jones, Bishop Paul, References, Ch. XXV, Note 28, 716
Jones, Rufus M., References, Ch. XXIII, Note 4, 713
Jordon, David Starr, 242, 245, 507
Josephites, 572
Jourdan, Gen., 324
Journey's End, at West Point, 549
Jusserand, mentioned by President Wilson in bitter comment on France, 252
Justin Martyr, 570

Kaiser, Wilhelm II, 235
Kant, Immanuel, 92, 226
Kapp *Putsch,* prevented by strike, 634
Kelly, Abby, 269
Kellogg, Frank B., 132, 299
Kellogg, Major Walter Guest, References, Ch. XXIII, Note 21, 713
Kellogg Pact (See Pact of Paris), 187
Kelsey, Mary, References, Ch. XI, Note 28, 707
Kendall, C. W., References, Ch. XXIV, Note 18, 714
Kennedy, Charles Rann, 655
Kent, James, 241
Kenworthy, Commander, J. M., 314; References, Ch. XIV, Note 27, 708
Kerney, James, References, Ch. XII, Note 20, 707
Kerrick, Harrison S., References, Ch. VIII, Note 25, 705
Ketcham Brothers, the "fighting Quakers," 452
Ketcham, Charles B., 53
Key, Ellen, 281
Key, Francis Scott, 441
Kingman, Harry, References, Ch. XXIII, Note 2, 712
Kingsley, Charles, 232
Kirkland, Edward Chase, References, Ch. XVIII, Note 12, 710
Kirkland, President of Harvard, 63, 365
Knights of Columbus, 509
Knoeppel, C. E., 301
Knox, Philander C., 132, 177, 178, 179
Korea, non-violent demonstration in, 629
Kropotkin, Prince Peter, 142
Krüdener, Baroness von, 102
Ku Klux Klan, 461
Kuropatkin, General, 494

Labor, and peace, 162
Labor and Socialist International, and war resistance, 616
Labor Reformers, meeting of 1872, 316
Lacedæmonia, 122
Lacey, General, letter to, from George Washington, on Quakers, 559
Lactantius, 570
Ladd, William, 12, 15, 21, 27, 33, 34, 36, 55, 64, 97, 100, 141, 157, 181, 197, 224, 239, 241, 253, 258, 266, 269, 283, 343, 369, 383, 384, 399, 404, 406, 410, 466, 527, 530, 544, 551
  and Thomas S. Grimkè, 379
  conflict with William Lloyd Garrison, 392
  on capital punishment, 408
  on early tactics of the peace movement, Appendix IV, 691
  on patriotism, 234
  on the New England Non-Resistance Society, 396
  plan for a congress and High Court of Nations, 93
  sketch of, 370
  information on, References, Ch. XVI, Note 8, 709
Lafayette, 160
Laidler, Harry W., References, Ch. XXIV, Note 7, 714
Lake Mohonk Conferences, 240, 283, 382, 410, 482
Landis, James M., 182

Land Monopoly, 517
Lane, Winthrop D., References, Ch. XXIII, Note 27, 713
Langdon, Dr., of Harvard, 32
Langley, 314
Lao-tse, 7, 532, 534, 558, 569
Laski, Harold J., 660
Lasky, Jesse L., 350
Lasswell, Harold D., 348
Lathrop, John, 61
Latzko, Andreas, quoted, 262
Laughlin, Clara E., 41
Lawrence, Col. T. E., 649
Lawson, Charles Francis, References, Ch. VIII, Note 19, 705
League of Nations, 61, 101, 180, 667; and *status quo,* 111
League of Nations Fourth Assembly, resolution on sanctions of force, 109
League of Peace (See League to Enforce Peace), 499
League of Universal Brotherhood, 416, 425, 610
League of Women for Universal Disarmament, 281
League to Enforce Peace, 42, 107, 499, 506
Lebedos, 121
Lecky, W. E. H., 529, 554; quoted, 88
Leeds, Josiah W., 346
Lenin, 615, 619
LeRoy, N. Y., and its battle monument, 354
Levée en masse, 324
Levermore, Charles H., 242
Levinson, Salmon O., 175, 177, 178, 179, 183, 185
Lewis, W. Lee, inventor of lewisite, 314
Liberal Republicans, peace plank, 478
Liberty Loan, poster, 43
Lincoln, Dr. Edward A., 593
Lincoln, President, 38, 223, 439, 444, 471, 586, 658; and "compensated emancipation," 437; tribute to war-supporting women, 274
Lindbergh, Col., 155, 354
Lippmann, Walter, 653
Lipsius, Justus, 263
Lipsky, Abram, References, Ch. VIII, Note 20, 705
Little, Dr. Arthur D., 611
Livermore, Abiel Abbot, 425
Livermore, Mary A., 170, 272, 441
Lives, lost through World War, References, Ch. XIV, Note 12, 708
Locarno Treaties, 61, 108
Lockwood, Belva A., 38, 226, 276, 285, 492, 496
Lollards, 573
Lombards, 122
Longfellow, Henry Wadsworth, 198, 389, 448, 449
Lonn, Ella, 147, 326
Lord, Eleazer, 364
Lorenzetti, Figure of Peace at Siena, 551
Lorwin, Lewis L., 615
Love, Alfred H., 99, 168, 169, 275, 276, 278, 467, 468, 470, 479, 490, 496, 519
  Sketch of, 470
  References, Ch. XIX, Note 2, 711
  References, Ch. XIX, Note 5, 711
Lovejoy, Elijah, 391
Low, Sidney, 674
Lowell, James Russell, 389, 446
Lowell, President of Harvard, 507
Lucy Stone League, 283
Luxemburg, Rosa, 615
Lycian League, 89, 121
Lynch, Frederick, 511; References, Ch. XI, Note 24, 706

MacDonald, Ramsay, 162, 511
MacDougall, William, 184, 518
Mace, William H., a historian, on Quakers in World War, 562
Machiavelli, 313
MacKaye, Percy, 355, 550
MacLeod, William Christy, References, Ch. XXIII, Note 8, 713
Macon, Isaiah, 585
MacPhail, Agnes C., 245
Madison, President, 208
Madison Square Garden, 462
Mahan, Rear Admiral, 79, 120
Maid of Saragossa, 264
Maine, Battleship, 488; refusal to arbitrate question of sinking, 130
Maine Peace Society, 11
Maine Wesleyan Seminary, 240
Malcolm, Howard, 175, 239
Maly, Dr. J., and germ warfare, 313

Man Power, the drive for, 323
Manifest Destiny, new meaning of, 345
Mann, Col. A. Dudley, 430
Manual of Citizenship Training, teachings on democracy, etc., 336
Manual of Peace, by Thomas C. Upham, and the peace societies, 381
Marburg, Theodore, 107
Marcoartu, Don Arturo de, 225
Margheritona, 264
Marshall, Chief Justice John, 96
Marsilius of Padua, 89
Marti, Oscar A., References, Ch. XXIV, Note 12, 714
Martin, George W., References, Ch. XXV, Note 14, 715
Martin, Grace and Rachel, 270
Marx, Karl, 153
Mason, Captain, 30
Massachusetts Peace Society, 5, 15
on conscription, 325
on cost of war, 197
on war-making governments, 410
on women and peace, 265
Massachusetts Radical Peace Society, 470
Massachusetts State Legislature, 64, 97, 124
Massachusetts State Legislature, resolution against Mexican War, 424
Mather, Richard, 31
Maupassant, Guy de, 142
May, Lieutenant Mark A., 591, 593
May, Samuel J., 66, 267, 368, 370, 392, 426, 460
and Channing, 405
and Civil War, 450
Mayflower, 293
Mazzoleni, Angelo, 473
McClellan, Gen., 333
McConnell, Bishop Francis J., 19, 663
McCracken, Chancellor, 314
McGarvey, J. W., 37
McKenzie, F. A., References, Ch. XXIV, Note 18, 714
McKinley, President, 649; on acquisition of the Philippines, 492
McLean, John, 241
McMurdy, R., 22, 128, 196, 226, 479
Mead, Edwin D., 369
Mead, Lucia Ames, 285, 317
References, Ch. VIII, Note 1, 705
References, Ch. XV, Note 10, 709
Megarians, 121
Melians, 121
Melite, 121
Memorial to peace treaty between Norway and Sweden, 554
Mencius, 569; quoted, 174
Mencken, H. L., 138
Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, on war resistance, 608
Mennonites, 532, 575; 585
Merignhac, M. A., References, Ch. VII, Note 5, 704
Merrill, George, 459
Merrill, Thomas, 239
Merrow, Reuben, 374
Methodist General Conference, peace work, 48
Metternich, 103, 324, 429
Mexico, policy of William M. Evarts toward, 168; threatened war with, 48
Mexican War, 36; enlistments, 326
Miles, Major Sherman, quoted, 464
Mill, John Stuart, 155
Miller, Joaquin, 449
Milton, John, quoted, 322
Military Intelligence Association, 348
Military Intelligence Division, 206
Military Order of the Loyal Legion, 348
Military Order of the World War, 247, 348
Military Training, 48
Military Training Camps Association, 348
Milner, Lord, 629
Milton, John, 552
Miner, A. A., References, Ch. XIX, Note 1, 711
Minot, Me., 371
Mirza Ali Muhammed, 628
Missionaries, twenty-five in China, statement on military protection, 22
Missions, Jerusalem conference of 1928, statement on military protection, 23
Missions, War and, 20
Mitchell, Col. Jonathan, 146
Mitchell, John, 637

Mitylene, 121
Mobilization, as test of aggression, 77
Mobilization Day, 351, 666 (See Defense Day)
Mohonk, Lake (See Lake Mohonk Conferences), 482
Molokans, Russian, 590
Monroe, President, and his Doctrine, 106
Montaigne, 146
Montesquieu, 210
Moore, Frank, 274
Moore, John Bassett, 69, 130, 185
Mooyart, J. N., 374
Moravians, 574, 647
More, Thomas, 210
Moritzen, Julius, References, Ch. I, Note 4, 701
Morley, John, 674
Morrison, Charles Clayton, 177, 182, 186
Morrison, J. E., References, Ch. XI, Note 9, 706
Moss and Lang, *Manual of Military Training*, 333
Mo-Ti, 569
Mott, James, 469
Mott, Lucretia, 275, 278, 285, 469; Alfred H. Love at funeral of, 473
Muravieff, Count, 493
Murray, Gilbert, 538, 595
Myers, Denis P., References, Ch. VII, Note 16, 705
Mystic, Conn., peace meetings at, 240, 475

Naples, 122
Narragansett Indians, 31
Nasmyth, George W., 142
National Arbitration and Peace Congress—1907, 250
National Board of Medical Examiners, 509
National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations, 286
National Civic Federation, 247, 348, 509
National Compensated Emancipation Co., 436
National Council of Congregational Churches, 54
National Council of Jewish Women, 286
National Council for Prevention of War, 48, 496, 512, 522, 552
National Defense Act of 1920, 347
National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, 286
National Guard, 317
National League of Women Voters, 286
National Reserve Council, 509
National Rifle Association, marksmanship contests, 339
National Security League, 247, 348, 509
National Student Conference of College Y. M. and Y. W. C. A.'s—1927, 547
National Study Conference on the Churches and World Peace, 48
National Women's Christian Temperance Union, 286
National Women's Conference of American Ethical Union, 280
National Women's Suffrage Association, 275
National Women's Trade Union League, 286
Nationalism, and Patriotism, References, Ch. XII, Note 5, 707
Navy Day, 351
Navy League, 339, 348
Nazarenes, anti-war religious body of Europe, 594, 659
Nearing, Scott, 505
Nebuchadnezzar, 569
Negro, The, effect on, of the Civil War, 461
Negroes, and Universal Peace Society, 466
New Appeal, The (See *The Appeal to Reason*), 505
New England Anti-Slavery Convention, 268
New England Non-Resistance Society, 395; Declaration of Principles—1838, Appendix V, 694
New Republic, The, 177
  and American entry into World War, 501
  on war leadership of educated people, 251
Newspapers, and war, 203
Newton, Sir Isaac, 307
Newton Theological Institute, 239
New York Peace Society, 508;—1910, and women, 283

Niblack, Admiral, A. P., 158
Nicaragua, intervention in, 48, 166, 651
Niebuhr, Reinhold, References, Ch. V, Note 25, 703
Nightingale, Florence, 202
Niles, H., References, Ch. XXII, Note 11, 712
Nitti, Francesco, 200
No-Conscription Fellowship, 630
No More War, on capital punishment, 409
No More War Movement, of England, 163
Nobel, Alfred, 67
Nobel Peace Prize, 241, 473
Noé, Amédée de (See Cham), 295
Nola, 122
Non-Resistance, The Myth of, 531
Non-Resistance Society, Declaration of Principles—1838, Appendix V, 694
Non-Violence, its working, 620
North East Ohio Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 53
Northend, Charles, References, Ch. XVII, Note 5, 710
Norway and Sweden, prevention of war—1905, 631
Nott, President Eliphalet of Union College, 436
Noyes, W. A., 308
Nyrop, Christophe, References, Ch. VIII, Note 15, 705

Oakes, President of Harvard, 31
Oberlin College, 42
Oberlin, O., center of early pacifism, 427
O'Connell, Daniel, 403
Odell, George, 51
Oggel, M. V., 177
Olcott, C. I., References, Ch. XIX, Note 19, 711
Oldcastle, Sir John, 573
Olive Leaves for the People, 411, 433
Olympic Games, 1928, Holland, 353
O'Hare, Kate Richards, 505
Open Conspiracy, The, of H. G. Wells, 618
Oppenheim, James, quoted, 672
Oracle, of Delphi, 122
Oregon crisis with England, and Elihu Burritt, 411
Origen, 17, 530
Origin of Species, 142
Oropians, 122
Otis, William Bradley, 335
Outlawry of War, 61; aims, 177; American Committee for, 179
Overt Act, as evidence of aggression, 71

"Pacificator," 34
Pacifism, as moral, dramatic, heroic equivalent of war, 668
and causes of war, 665
and conscription, 662
and governments, 664
and international fear, 666
and man-power, 661
meaning today, 535
Pact of Paris, 51, 61, 109, 187, 648; text, Appendix III, 688
Page, Kirby, 183
peace budget, 245
References, Ch. XXV, Note 11, 715
References, Ch. XXIV, Note 27, 715
Painters and Decorators Union of Schenectady, 614
Palm, Andrew J., 39, 255
Palmerston, Lord, 502
Pan American Arbitration Congress, 132
Panama Canal Tolls Act, 130
Paris, Peace Conference of, 1849, 432
Park, Robert E., References, Ch. XXV, Note 22, 715
Parker, Sir Gilbert, 204
Parvine, M. L., 364
Pascal, Blaise, 210
Passy, Frederic, 481
Pasteur, 306
Pathé News Reels, 350
Patrick, Gen. M. M., 298
Patriotism, and Nationalism, References, Ch. XII, Note 5, 707
Patriotism, Elihu Burritt on, 412; redefining, 231
Paul, 532
Paulicians, 571
Payson, Edward, quoted, 360
Peabody, Andrew Preston, 66, 176, 372, 426, 451
Peabody, W. B. O., 405
Peace Association of Friends in America, 67, 498

"Peace at any price," uses of the phrase, 502
Peace Bridge, between Canada and U. S., 554
Peace Conference, International, at Frankfort—1850, 432
in Brussels—1848, 432
in Paris—1849, 432
projected in France, 430
Peace Conferences, International, 1889 to 1913, 480
Peace Day, various proposals for, 496
Peace Flag, at headquarters of Universal Peace Union, in Spanish-American War, 491
Peace Forum, The, issue of August, 1914, 499
Peace Letter, in Germany, 610
in U. S. A., 610
References, Ch. XXIV, Note 3, 714
to Prime Minister, of Lord Ponsonby, 609
Peace Portal, at Blaine, Wash., 554
Peace Union of German Catholics, 617
Peary, Admiral, and peace flag of D. A. R., 553
Peck, Benjamin D., resignation from American Peace Society, 415
Peckover, Miss P. H., 544
Penn, William, 7, 30, 57, 91, 622
Penney, John Witham, References, Ch. XVI, Note 8, 709
People, drive for, for military purposes, 348
People's Council, 503
Pequots, Massacre of, at Mystic, Conn., 30
Pera, 121
Perla, Leo, References, Ch. IX, Note 12, 706
Pershing, General, 289, 349
Personages, as a lure to peace support, 207
Peterman, Georgianna, 274
Pettit, Henry, 553
"Philadelphus" (Samuel Whelpley), 155
"Philanthropos" (William Ladd), 141
Philip II, 30
Philippine Islands, possession of, our refusal to arbitrate, 130
Phillips, Walter Alison, References, Ch. VI, Note 8, 704
Phillips, Wendell, 441, 546
"Philo Pacificus," 10
Phipps, Mrs. Sarah, 267
Picards, 572
Pierce, President, 294
Pike, Gen. Albert, 423, 449
Pilgrims, 30
Pitcher, Molly, 271
Pitt, William, 210, 655
Pittalus, 122
Plebs, "general strike" of, in Ancient Rome, 636
Plow, Peace, of Universal Peace Union, 553
Plymouth Brethren, 590
Podiebrad, King, 90
Policy, as cause of war, 70
Polk, President, 125
Ponsonby, Lord, 73, 205, 217
Peace Letter, text of, 609
Peace Letter to Prime Minister, 110
Pontarcus, 122
Poor Men of Lyons, 572
Pope Alexander VI, 123
Popes, as arbitrators, 122
Porter, Dr. Eliot, study of peace attitudes of 1000 college students, 547
Prang and Co., L., 552
Pratt, Hodgson, 473, 481
Presbyterian Church in the United States (South), 54
Prainsus, 122
Price, Joseph Tregelles, 11
Priestly, Dr. Joseph, letter from Benjamin Franklin to, on war, 292
Prince of Wales, 202
Princeton, battleship on which gun called "The Peacemaker" burst in 1844, 30
Pringle, Cyrus, 586
Private Military Schools, listed by Department of the Interior, 338
Prizes, for peace essays, etc., 239
Prohibition Party, on arbitration, 128
Provost Marshal General, report on Draft Act of World War, 588; Second Report of, 1919, 148
Pseudonyms, used by early peace writers, 363

Pufendorf, von, 91
Pugsley Prize, 240, 483
Puritans, and Quakers, 636; training days, 30
Putney, Albert H., References, Ch. XXV, Note 13, 715
Pythagoreans, 659

Quakers (See Friends, Society of), 166
and abolitionists, 406
and New England Puritans, 636
and War, 559
in Civil War, 451, 456
in World War, as presented by Syllabus of History of New York State Schools, 561
Quidde, Ludwig, 242, 481
Quincy, Edmund, 393, 395
Quincy, Josiah, 368, 372

Radio, military propaganda over, 351
Ramus, Pierre, 615
Randall, James R., 448
Ranger, Walter E., 257
Rational Patriot, The, References, Ch. II, Note 7, 702
Read, Thomas Buchanan, 272
Reading Railroad Company, 168
Recruiting Week, in World War, and enlistments, 148
Red Cross, 509
Republican Party, on conscription, 330
Reserve Officers' Association, 348
Resolutions, of churches on war and peace, 51
Revolutionary War, 31
as seen by Thomas S. Grimké, 376
enlistments, 325
Revolution by violence, 643
Revolutions in Europe, and American peace movement, 429; effect on American peace societies, 409
Rhode Island Radical Peace Society, 288, 470
Rhode Island Schools, inculcation of war ideas, 257
Rice, Roswell, Jr., 35
Richard, Henry, 481
Richards, Edward C. M., References, Ch. XXIV, Note 9, 714
Ritchie, Andrew, 63
Robbins, Charles Burton, 308
Robbins, Very Rev. Howard Chandler, References, Ch. XXVI, Note 4, 716
Robins, Raymond, 177
Robinson, Ellen, 286
Robinson, James Harvey, quoted, 2
Rogerenes, 475; sketch of, 582
Rogers, R. V., 380
Rolland, Romain, 539; quoted, 646
Rome, 122
Roosevelt, Theodore, 138, 143, 235, 242, 496, 498, 556, 619
Roosevelt, Theodore (the younger), 352
Root, Elihu, 132, 242
Ross, Edward A., quoted, 194
R. O. T. C. courses, in colleges and schools, number attending, 331; Manual, 332
Royden, A. Maude, on alternatives to war over invasion of Belgium, 652
Ruhr, invasion of, and non-violent resistance in, 630
Rush, Dr. Benjamin, on military training, 343; plan for a peace department, 245
Russell, Bertrand, 160
Russia, blockade of, 70; Passport Controversy of 1911, our refusal to arbitrate, 130
Russo-Japanese War, 496
Ryan, John A., 73

Sabine Women, 263
St. Louis Exposition, 552
St. Pierre, Abbé, 7, 91
Salisbury, Earl of, 264
Sampson, Deborah, 271
Sandino, 87, 651
Sassoon, Siegfried, poem, "Aftermath," 46
Sayers, Tom, 202
Sayre, John Nevin, References, Ch. XIV, Note 13, 714
Sayre, Rev. John, 580
Scabbard and Blade, 247
Scammell, J. M., 311
Schleswig-Holstein, 432
Schopenhaur, 265
Schreiner, Olive, 281
Schücking, Walter, 662
Schwab, Charles M., 304
Schwenkfeld, Caspar, 576
Schwenkfelders, 532, 576

Science, Mobilization of, 306
Scots-Irish Presbyterians, non-violent resistance of, 625
Scott, Gen. Winfield, 423
Scott, Job, 5
Scudder, Vida D., References, Ch. XXV, Note 26, 716
Seabury, Mary and Helen, 240
Seabury Prizes, 242
Sears, President of Brown University, 344
Seaver, James E., References, Ch. XXIII, Note 9, 713
Sebastiani, Minister of Foreign Affairs for France, 106
Seelye, President of Smith College, 487
Sellon, Count de, 11
Senate, and arbitration, 130
Sennacherib, 568
Separatists (or Zoarites), 578
Sergius, Grand Duke, 643
Sewall, Samuel E., 459
Seward, William H., and "compensated emancipation," 437
Shakers, 532, 578, 622
Shantung, Chinese boycott over, 638
Shapley, Harlow, 675
Shastid, Dr. Thomas Hall, 230
Shaw, Anna Howard, 489
Shaw, George Bernard, 62, 669
Shelley, 650
Shepherd, William G., 315
Sheridan, General, on value of ruthlessness in war, 212
Sheridan, troops in Shenandoah Valley, 444
Sherman, Gen., 159, 455
Sherman, march to the sea, 444
Shotwell, James T., 76, 189
Sicyonians, 122
Sikhs, Akali, 642
Silverman, Joseph, 40, 504
Simonides, 122
Simons, Menno, 575
Simpson, Rev. Mr., 20
Sims, Admiral, 298
Sinclair, Harry, 352
Sinclair, Upton, 505
Sisson, Susan, 269
Slavery, nations abolishing it without war, 460
Smedley, Agnes, References, Ch. XXIV, Note 28, 715
Smiley, Albert K., 482
Smiley, Alfred, 482
Smiley, Daniel, 482
Smith, Dr. Ellen Goodell, 484
Smith, Gen. Jacob H., 490
Smith, Gerrit, 426, 455
Smith, Herbert E., References, Ch. XV, Note 8, 709
Smith, Lt.-Col. Leroy F., References, Ch. XIX, Note 35, 712
Smith, Matson M., References, Ch. XVI, Note 1, 709
Smyth, Newman, 614
Social Democratic League, 505
Social Science Association, 344
Socialists, against war in England, 592; in World War, U. S., 505
Society of Christian Morals, France, 11, 409
Soddy, Professor, and Nobel Prize, 307
Solon, 121
Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, 319
Sousa, John Philip, on military training, 336
South Carolina, threatened secession of, 182
Southard, Samuel L., 106
Soviet Russia, 109
Spafford, Col. Edward E., 330
Spaniards, Medieval, and their warships with Christian names, 29
Spanish-American War, 38
Spanish revolt against Riff War, 1909, 631
Spargo, John, 505
Spear, Charles, 408, 460
Spencer, Anna Garlin, 285
Spencer, Fanny Bixbey, References, Ch. XV, Note 14, 709
Spinoza, 575
Sport, International, 518
Standard Oil Company, 429
Standish, Capt. Miles, 293
Stanga, Luzia, 264
Stanton, Elizabeth Cady, 270
Stanton, R. L., 37
Stanwood, Edward, References, Ch. VII, Note 12, 704
Stedman, Edmund Clarence, 449
Steed, Henry Wickham, 76
Sternburg, von, 236
Stevens, Thaddeus, 477
Stidolph, Sophia, Ann Augusta (wife of William Ladd), 371

Stokes, Rose Pastor, 505
Stone, Lucy, 270, 275, 470
Storck, John, quoted, 514
Story, Joseph, 241
Stow, Baron, 405
Straton, John Roach, 40
Strike for Peace, The, 631
Strong, Nathan, 381
Sturge, Joseph, 430, 432
Sully, 7, 90
Sumner, Charles, 127, 167, 190, 198, 372, 412, 439, 441, 460, 477, 478
  and Civil War, 450
  and "compensated emancipation," 437
  and Elihu Burritt's "ocean penny postage," 435
  on Mexican War, 424
  peace prize, 240
Summerall, Major-General Charles P., 80
Sumner, William Graham, quoted, 220, 524
Sunday, Billy, 40
Suttner, Bertha von, 286, 481
Swift, Dean, 647
Syllabus in History of New York State's School, on Quakers in World War, 561.
Sylvagius, John, 90

Tacitus, 263
Taft, William Howard, 107, 497, 498, 516
Talbot, Mary Anne, 264
Tappan, Lewis, 453
Tardieu, André, 204
Taylor, Bayard, 449
Taylor, Ernest E., References, Ch. XVIII, Note 25, 711
Teapot Dome, 352
Tenney, W. J., References, Ch. XVIII, Note 27, 711
Teos, 121
Tertullian, 17, 570
Themistocles, 121
Theodore, King of Abyssinia, 22
Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths, 122
Theron of Agrigentum, 122
Thomas, M. G., 453
Thomas, Norman, 159, 600
Thomas, Reuen, References, Ch. XI, Note 14, 706
Thomas, Wilbur K., References, Ch. XIV, Note 14, 708
Thompson, "Big Bill," 346
Thompson, Lord, 192
Thompson, Thomas, Jr., 97
Thomson, Ignatius, 253
Thoreau, Henry David, 389, 526
Thucydides, 122
Thurston, Stephen, 18, 142, 377
Tilden, Stephen, 445
Tildon, Theodore, 449
Timrod, Henry, 449
Tiplady, Thomas, 41
Tirpitz, Admiral von, 235
Todd, Arthur James, References, Ch. XXIV, Note 30, 715
Todd, Brigade Major William, 146
Tolstoy, Leo, 496, 532, 536, 578, 590; and the new England Non-Resistance Society, 395
Tolstoyans, in Soviet Russia, 595
Townsend, Mary Ashley, 449
Trask, George, 399
Traubel, Horace, quoted, 566; 667
Treaties, broken, as test of aggression, 71
Treaties, Defensive and Alliances, 114
Treaty of Chaumont, 103
Treitschke, 138
Trotsky, Leon, References, Ch. XXIV, Note 29, 715
Trueblood, Benjamin F., 482, 488, 495, 505
Tuck, Amos, 98
Tucker, Josiah, 215
Tunkers (See Dunkards), 576
Turchin, Madame, 274
Turks, and Baha'i, 628
Turner, John Kenneth, 148
Tutankamen, 567
Twain, Mark, quoted, 26
Tyler, President, 30
Tyrolesian Village, story of, 624

Ufford, H. G., 364
Underhill, co-leader in Pequot Massacre, 30
Unitarian Ministerial Association, 52
Unitas Fratrum, 574
United Spanish War Veterans, 492
United States Revolver Association, 339
United States Steel Corporation, 509

Unity, 177, 178, 185
Universal Draft Law, in U. S., 328
Universal Peace Society (later Universal Peace Union), 466; statement issued at first meeting, 467
Universal Peace Union, 38, 168, 223, 240, 248, 275, 288, 344, 469, 474, 490, 496, 504, 552, 578
Unknown Soldier, 354
Upham, Thomas C., 17, 19, 65, 93, 215, 224, 314, 372, 381, 426; on capital punishment, 409
Upton, Brevet Major Emory, 143

Vaillant, Edward, 616
Valentino, Rudolph, 546
Van Dyke, Henry, 257, 258
Van Tyne, Claude H., 146
Vanzetti, Bartholomeo, 564
Varnes, 122
Vaudois, 572
Venezuelan Boundary Dispute, 484
Venice, and Genoa, treaty of Alliance, 123
Verigin, Peter, 578
Versailles Conference, 628, 638
Versailles Treaty, 180
Vidaurre, Don Manuel Lorenzo, 145
Villard, Fanny Garrison, 287
Villard, Oswald Garrison, References, Ch. XXIV, Note 20, 714
Visigoths, 122
Vogue, Viscomte de, References, Ch. XII, Note 7, 707
Voltaire, 315

Wadsworth, James M., 79
Waldenses, 572, 666
Waldo, Peter, 572
Walker, Amasa, 393, 426, 453
  on Mexican War, 413
  resignation from American Peace Society, 415
Walling, William English, 505
Walsh, Senator, of Montana, 349
War, and warfare—a distinction, 69
War, causes of, 286 wars examined by Massachusetts Peace Society, Appendix II, 686
War, and crime, 199
War Department, manual of citizenship training, 85
  "procurement planning," 305
  training regulations, 79
Wars of the Gulls, The, 222
Wars, list of, 1815-1929, Appendix I, 679
War Novels, 549
Wars, number of wars and conflicts, 1815 to 1929 inclusive, 119
War of 1812, enlistments, 326
"War Planners," as revealed in Washington by Associated Press Dispatch, 299
War, Prevention and Abolition, 555
War Resistance, resolutions of labor bodies, etc., 616; supported by periodicals, 608
War Resisters, increasing use of term, 604
War Resisters' International, 604
War Resisters' League, 512; References, Ch. XXIV, Note 3, 714
Waring, Col. George E., Jr., 487
Warren County, Ohio, peace society, 369
Washburn, John M., quoted, 422
Washington Conference on Limitation of Armament, 47
Washington, George, 185; tribute to women for aid in war, 271
Washington, President, and Quakers, 559
Water Cure, in Philippines, 490
Watrous, Timothy, 6, 582
Watrous, Zachariah, 6
Watson, William, 372
Watterson, "Marse Henry," 345
Watts, Dr., hymn, 165
Weatherly, Ulysses G., References, Ch. XXV, Note 10, 715
Webster, Daniel, 241
Wehberg, Hans, on war resistance, 608
Weigall, Arthur E. P., 568
Weld, Angelina Grimké (See Grimké, Angelina), 375
Wellock, Wilfred, 635
Wells, H. G., 225, 237, 618, 620, 636
Wentworth, Lydia G., References, Ch. XI, Note 8, 706
Wertenbaker, Thomas Jefferson, References, Ch. III, Note 7, 702
Wertheimer, Mildred S., References, Ch. VI, Note 6, 704
Wesley, John, quoted, 118
West, Samuel, 32

Weston, Hannah, 271
Wheeler, Daniel, 102
Wheeler, Frederick, 432
Whelpley, Melanchton, 364
Whelpley, Samuel, 9, 63, 84, 155, 197, 215, 363, 504, 526
Whipple, Charles K., 408
Whipple family, of the Rogerenes, 475
Whipple, Leon, References, Ch. XXIII, Note 15, 713
White, Andrew D., References, Ch. III, Note 9, 702
White, Laura A., References, Ch. XVIII, Note 21, 710
Whitman, Walt, 449, 497
Whitney, Edson L., References, Ch. XII, Note 16, 707
Whittier, John Greenleaf, 165, 268, 270, 447, 478
Will, Allen S., 226
Willard, Sidney, 97
William of Ciervia, 90
Williams, Anna B., References, Ch. XXIII, Note 13, 713
Williams, Bruce, References, Ch. VI, Note 6, 704
Williams, Hon. James, 69
Williams, Roger, References, Ch. XXII, Note 9, 712
Williams, Thomas, 32, 140, 460
Wilson, President, 107, 126, 223, 242, 248, 439, 497, 502, 596, 658
  on causes of World War, 158
  References, Ch. XII, Note 20, 707
Winchester Arms Company, 340
Windham County (Connecticut), Peace Society, 57
Wing, George C., Jr., References, Ch. XVI, Note 8, 709
Wirt, William, 241
Wise, Stephen S., 504
Witte, Count, 494
Wolfe, A. B., References, Ch. XXII, Note 14, 712
Wolff, Joseph, 21
Wolsey, Cardinal, 90
Women's Christian Temperance Union, 496
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 287
Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, 289
Women's Peace Festival, 279
Women's Peace Society, 287; References, Ch. XXIV, Note 3, 714
Women's Peace Union, 246, 288; References, Ch. XXIV, Note 3, 714
Women's Universal Alliance for Peace, 281
Wood, Fernando, 440
Wood, Gen. Leonard, 301
Worcester, Noah, 5, 9, 15, 27, 36, 55, 63, 104, 105, 140, 146, 175, 197, 200, 202, 207, 208, 223, 253, 265, 275, 343, 361, 372, 399, 405, 466, 502, 564
  interest in a Congress and High Court of Nations, 94
  on capital punishment, 408
  on conscription, 324
  on governments, 410
  prophecy of Civil War, 438
  sketch of, 365
Wordsworth, William, 410
World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, 41, 48, 508
World Court, Optional Clause of, 109
World Federation of Education Associations, 496
World Goodwill Day, 497
World Peace Foundation, 500, 506; table of U. S. war expenditures, 318
World War, 39
World War, actual cost per day compared to estimate of Jan Bliokh, 297
World War Relics, act approved May 26, 1928, 354
World's W. C. T. U., 281
Wright, Elizur, 460
Wright, Frances, References, Ch. IX, Note 15, 706
Wright, Henry C., 392, 410, 451, 468, 504, 621
Wycliffe, John, 573

Xerxes, 121

Yale, Cyrus, 377
Yale University, military scholarship, 350
Yard, James M., 22
Young Democracy, The, 503

Young, Edward, References, Ch. IV, Note 1, 703
Young Men's Christian Association, 509, 512
Young Men's Hebrew Association, 512
Young Women's Christian Association, 509, 512
Young Women's Hebrew Association, 512
Youth, the drive for, for military purposes, 330

Zechariah, 568
Zelah Van Loan World Friendship Award, 242
Zenobia, 263
Zimand, Savel, 317
Zoarites, 578